

MISSISSIPPI.

Sallie Millsaps to be postmaster at Hazlehurst, Miss., in place of Sallie Millsaps. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1910.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Robert F. Emerson to be postmaster at East Rochester, N. H. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

NEW YORK.

Frederick Rohde to be postmaster at Stapleton, N. Y., in place of Adolph Lienhart, removed.

OKLAHOMA.

Clay Cross to be postmaster at Skiatook, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William M. Deihm to be postmaster at Honey Brook, Pa., in place of Thomas F. Hampton, deceased.

John W. Ramsey to be postmaster at Midland, Pa., in place of Frank P. Oberlin, who failed to qualify.

G. Clinton Williams to be postmaster at Spring City, Pa., in place of G. Clinton Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1911.

TENNESSEE.

John R. Richards to be postmaster at Oliver Springs, Tenn., in place of Abraham L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1911.

H. Filmour Shoun to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., in place of Joseph W. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1910.

VIRGINIA.

Charles A. Lacy to be postmaster at Houston, Va., in place of Charles A. Lacy. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1911.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

William Lindsay to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reed M. Fawell to be a lieutenant. Midshipman Arnold H. Vanderhoof to be an ensign.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Horace M. Bradley, Green Cove Springs.

ILLINOIS.

John C. Hale, North Chicago.

E. E. Nicholson, Beardstown.

INDIANA.

Edgar T. Botkin, Farmland.

Enos Coffin, Carthage.

Robert B. Hanna, Fort Wayne.

William H. Hathaway, Aurora.

John Lynn, La Fontaine.

Joel F. Martin, Bourbon.

Frank R. Morrison, Galveston.

William O. Nash, Jasonville.

Percy V. Ruch, Mulberry.

John C. Schleffler, Wolcottville.

IOWA.

Daniel P. Ellsworth, Lohrville.

O. C. Hill, Clearfield.

Louis C. Kurtz, Des Moines.

Almon C. Steele, Coon Rapids.

LOUISIANA.

B. F. Edwards, Marksville.

Richard E. Hodges, Jena.

MAINE.

Abial H. Jones, Wilton.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Chestina B. Robbins, East Templeton.

Harriet F. Seaverns, North Scituate.

MICHIGAN.

Charles Gauntlett, Milan.

MINNESOTA.

Cornelius Berghuis, Clara City.

Sarah Dahl, Cottonwood.

Fred W. Olson, Raymond.

MONTANA.

John J. McDonald, Townsend.

Don E. Schanek, Libby.

OHIO.

John Shaw, Leroy.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Clark D. Eckels, Cambridge Springs.

Burd R. Linder, Orwigsburg.

TEXAS.

John H. Carson, Dayton.

William D. McCaslin, Detroit.

Rufus H. Windham, Newton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 1, 1911.

[Continuation of the legislative day of Saturday, April 29, 1911.]

The recess having expired at 11 o'clock, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement: Hon. EDWARD L. TAYLOR, Jr., of Ohio, is hereby appointed a member of the board of directors of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb. Hon. THETUS W. SIMS holds over.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements on the free list, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements on the free list, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The bill was read by title.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS]. [Applause.]

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this debate it was not my purpose to engage in it. There are so many orators among the Members of this distinguished body that to sit and listen is not only a pleasure, but it seems to be almost a duty since one orator rarely enjoys the orations of other men. If some men love to talk, others should prefer to listen. But, Mr. Chairman, this whole debate has raged around the farmer and the interests of the farm; assertions have been made with such recklessness that I am in sympathy with Mark Twain when he said that he did not object to any speaker knowing all about his subject, but that he did object to any man knowing so much that was not true. The farmers of our country are patriotic citizens whose only interest in good government is that it shall promote the common interests of all our people and not the special interests of a few of them; and I wish to voice my protest against the good name and reputation of the farming classes of our country being used to protect the well-known abuses which have grown up in our Government and that the supposed interests of the farm shall be used to defeat progressive legislation which is intended for the benefit of all our people.

This is not the first instance, Mr. Chairman, when an attempt has been made to use the virtue which has its home on the farm to shelter the vice which exists in the commercial systems of our great cities. We have only to recall the debates on the floor of this House in 1906, when the frauds and corruption in the great packing houses was exposed to public view. The Beef Trust was then known to be a criminal corporation which had been systematically robbing the farmers on every load of cattle which were driven across the scales which lead from the feed lot to the slaughter pens. They were even then under indictment and active prosecution for criminal exploitation of the products of the farm; but when it became noised about that their methods of preparing and distributing their products were even more destructive to the general welfare of society than their methods of buying their produce from the farmer—that both producer and consumer were exploited—and that not even the public health was protected from their insatiable greed for gain, what influence was invoked to shield them from

exposure? It was a frantic appeal to the President to hold his hand, because the exposure would hurt the interest of the farmer. If ever brazen effrontery were carried further it is at the present moment, when the same appeal is being made to defeat the progressive legislation now under consideration. When will good citizenship be respected by the representatives of the special interests of this country?

F. J. Hagerbarth, vice president of the American National Live Stock Association, was among the first to attempt to use virtue to shield crime. In a signed statement published in the National Provisioner of June 16, 1906, he says:

The President has seen fit to ignore urgent requests from official representatives of the live-stock industry requiring him to withhold any radical message or reports to Congress bearing on abuses of the packing interests, for the reason that such message if heralded over the world would work irreparable loss, both at home and abroad, to the producers of live stock.

What a libel on the patriotism of the American farmer, that he could wish to coin the health and the well-being of the world and weigh it in the balance against the profits on his cattle. What convincing evidence of the power of money to dwarf even the soul of a man, born in the image of his Maker! Not a thought was given to the welfare of the thousands of employees who worked in these insanitary plants; not the least concern manifested for the health of the world; but the demand went forth that all this vice be smothered in order to protect the cattle growers of the Mississippi Valley from irreparable losses.

This plea for the farmer soon found its way to the floor of this House. In the National Provisioner of the same date is found this significant statement:

Members of Congress, inspired by the feeling of indignation among their constituents over the injury done to American industry by the President's ignorant and ill-considered assault on the meat trade, could not wait for a committee report on the meat-inspection bill, but began to express their sentiments as early as Tuesday of this week on the floor of the House.

The editors of the American Economist must have read this statement before writing some of their recent editorials about President Taft and Canadian reciprocity. This feeling of indignation was first aroused in the breast of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The RECORD shows that he asked unanimous consent that he should address the House on this important subject before the report of the committee brought it regularly before them for consideration. Mr. MONDELL appears in the RECORD as saying:

These reports and criticisms scattered broadcast, highly colored and exaggerated as they were passed along, have resulted in incalculable injury not only to the packers, but to the live-stock industry of the country generally. It was a bad day for Chicago and the packing and live-stock industries of the United States when that now historic porker slipped his trolley and fell—just where he fell is in controversy—and he goes down in history as entirely eclipsing that other famous Chicago animal, Mrs. O'Leary's cow, in the awful havoc and loss he has wrought. If the packing industries of this country were alone affected, their rights should demand attention; but the great live-stock industries of the country are equally affected. They have already suffered losses amounting to many millions by this agitation.

Now, was not that an awful blow to be landed on the solar plexus of the honest farmers of our country merely because the packers were selling decayed and diseased meats to the country and were destroying the health of their employees as well as of their customers? This message of President Roosevelt was nearly as destructive to the farming industries as the reciprocity pact as seen by the gentleman from Wyoming. Is it not wonderful how the American farmer manages to recover from these irreparable damages and recoup these incalculable injuries? And to think that these plagues should be visited on us one after the other by the headstrong action of Republican Presidents. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder that western papers are running an advertisement in the want columns for a candidate for President on the Republican ticket. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not wish to weary the committee with numerous quotations from the RECORD. If time permitted, it can be shown that many Members who profess to believe now that the recommendations of President Taft will ruin the farmer were equally convinced that the recommendations of President Roosevelt would ruin the stock grower in 1906. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They were wrong then, Mr. Chairman, and they are mistaken now. Their former efforts fastened an army of tax eaters on the Federal Treasury for life in order to give a decent reputation to the commercial products of "Packingtown" in the markets of the world, and their purpose now is to defeat the enactment of progressive legislation which will revise the tariff in the interests of the great consuming masses of our citizenship.

The policy of reciprocity has been attacked on the ground that it is inimical to the farming interests of the country, and that it is being adopted hastily without investigation or informa-

tion. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] was reckless enough of his reputation to hazard such a statement. He says:

You are proposing a great new policy that goes to the very social fabric of America, and where is the great committee of this House that has probed to the bottom of it and where is the book that has spread its investigations before the American people?

This well illustrates, Mr. Chairman, the difficulties which a famous specialist meets when he gets beyond his reservation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the gentleman from Maine were as familiar with current agricultural literature as he is with the contents of Hinds' Precedents he could not have been betrayed into so glaring an error. I do not know what estimate the farmers of Maine will put on this point of order which is raised by the distinguished parliamentarian against this pending legislation, but it will be a revelation to the intelligent and progressive farmers of the Middle West who have discussed this question for years and have been knocking at the doors of Congress and demanding the enactment of reciprocal legislation in the broadest terms. In the few minutes which have been allotted to me I can not attempt a full discussion of the advantages which reciprocity will bring to the farmers of our Nation, but I trust that I shall be able to show that the wonderful growth of public sentiment in favor of reciprocity in this country is due to the intelligent expression of agricultural thought and of the agricultural press. The gentleman from Maine regrets that Mr. Emery and his associates on the Tariff Board have not had time to make an exhaustive report on the subject. Does he not know that Mr. Saunders, who is Mr. Emery's associate, has written exhaustively on this very subject, and that he did so after careful study and personal investigation? No student who is at all familiar with agricultural literature or the evolution of progressive policies in the minds of the American farmer could have shown the ignorance which has been displayed in this debate by the would-be leaders of the farmers.

The great national movement among the farmers of the United States to advance reciprocal legislation began with a meeting held in the Grand Pacific Hotel in Chicago in 1905. There were present at that meeting delegates representing the National Live Stock Association, American Short Horn Association, National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago Commercial Association, Millers' National Federation, and other great producing and exporting interests. It was decided to hold a national conference to advance reciprocal tariff legislation. Mr. Alvin H. Saunders was chosen as the leader of the new movement. Who is Mr. A. H. Saunders? He is a member of the Tariff Board which was appointed by President Taft, and one of the men, according to the gentleman from Maine, who could so well make a scientific investigation of this subject. Mr. Saunders at that time was the editor of the Breeder's Gazette, the most influential and widely read farm journal in the United States. In accepting this appointment, Mr. Saunders issued a signed statement as to the purposes of the conference and of the necessity for its organization. This statement should prove interesting to those who have assumed that no investigation has been made and that no authority stands sponsor for reciprocal legislation. Mr. Saunders said:

The managing editor of the Gazette was unanimously requested to act as chairman of the committee on arrangements. He has consented to do so with the specific understanding that the interests of the farmers and stock growers should be paramount; that their wants should receive first consideration, and that partisan politics will have no place in the campaign to be waged.

I call particular attention, Mr. Chairman, that this movement at the very beginning was to be devoted to the interests of the farmer and the stock grower, and that it was to be non-partisan in its character. The statement went on to say:

We have in years of average production a large surplus of bread-stuffs and provisions for export. We grow more grain and mature more meat than is required for home consumption. The price received for the product consumed at home is largely governed by the price commanded by the surplus for which a market must be found abroad. We have virtually prohibited France and Germany from selling part of their manufactures here, and they have retaliated by gradually closing their markets against us. It is time therefore that somebody should take up the cudgels in this matter against those who for selfish purposes destroyed Blaine's reciprocity conventions, slaughtered the Kassar treaties, and are still barring the American stockmen and grain growers from a large and lucrative outlet for their goods.

There is no question of Republicanism or Democracy involved in this proposition. It is simply a matter of passing an act of Congress which will enable the President and his successors, no matter to what political party they belong, to open the doors of the hungry millions of Europe, put a roast in every French and German pot, and a loaf of good American bread upon every shelf from Rome to Copenhagen, and in doing it put probably \$100,000,000 per annum in the pockets of the American producers.

The thing can be brought about if we will drop party lines and put none but friends of this proposition in positions of Federal power. If Senators and the present Members of the House of Representatives will not do this thing, the people have the power to send men to Washington who will exercise that power. The sooner our public men understand this the better. This fight for better markets, worth unknown millions

per year to the farming communities, will not be won in a week or a year. It means a battle royal against entrenched power, but it will be won because it is right.

Mr. Chairman, that is the report to the farmers of this country by a member of the present Tariff Board, which they have studied for six long years. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Maine has never read it. It was published before he began the study of farm economics. There is always that disadvantage in a sudden change in occupation, but I can not forget the impression it made on my mind when I first read it. I was then an active farmer and was walking behind the plow and through the feed lots. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I had shipped my cattle to markets which were glutted, and had seen the sellers begging to receive decent bids for their offerings, and had my stock sold for prices which did not leave me the reasonable profit which was guaranteed to the manufacturers in the last Republican platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I enlisted in that campaign against entrenched privilege and helped to fight the battle because it was right. I was with Mr. Saunders for reciprocity then and I am for it now whether he is with me or against me. I would rather follow a plain American citizen on his honor as a man than to take my opinions from an official whose salary may depend upon the official reports he may sign. I did not foresee that I was one of the men who were to be sent to Washington with the power to act to take the place of some of those who having the power were refusing to act. But I am here, Mr. Chairman, ready to act, and I am proud of the intelligent vote which sent me here. I may not be able to fight the good fight, but I am willing to keep the faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No better presentation of the subject of reciprocity from a farmer's standpoint can be made than this statement made by this member of the Tariff Board, and I commend it to those who need instruction on this subject. It leads up to the very point which the gentleman from Maine well says is the "whole situation," the equilibrium between agriculture and manufactures. The gentleman says:

But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to overproduce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

The gentleman from Maine was chosen to open this debate and therefore is the leader of the opposition to reciprocal legislation; his words are an orthodox statement of stand-pat Republicanism as applied to the development of our agricultural industry. Now, what does this statement mean? The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] denounced the scheme of valorization or monopoly by which the Brazilian Government is seeking to maintain an equilibrium between the production of coffee and its consumption. This system, simply stated, is a limitation of the acreage which can be devoted to the cultivation of coffee. Mr. NORRIS says:

This agreement has been in successful operation since the latter part of 1908. In accordance with its terms, the Brazilian Government enacted a law preventing the planting of additional coffee trees and providing for severe penalties for any offense against this provision of the statute. Inspectors were appointed who went through the country and destroyed any new trees that had been planted and administered severe punishment against those who were guilty of an infraction of the law.

Did the gentleman from Maine get his ideas of valorization from Brazil, or did the Brazilian statesmen come to Maine for inspiration and instruction? Which nation has the genuine and which one possesses the "phony" statesman? The burden of proof is in favor of Brazil, because the gentleman himself informs us that "we have heard little of this doctrine of equilibrium of the home market among English-speaking nations." Therefore he kindly informs us just what it means—

And it is evident that both farmer and artisan will be most prosperous and the happiest when there are enough farmers to take the artisan's goods at a fair price and enough artisans, professional men, and so forth, to take the farmer's surplus at a fair price.

And to bring this ideal state about he proposes to limit the acreage to the capacity of the home market. Now, what does that mean to the farmer and to the Nation? We sold last year in the foreign markets over \$1,000,000,000 worth of the surplus products of American farms. This new statesmanship proposes to stop this production, refuse this enormous national income, and throw out of employment the thousands of farmers and their sons who produced this vast volume of wealth. Why take this radical action? Why, to establish an equilibrium between agriculture and manufacture. The southern farmers sold \$450,000,000 worth of cotton to foreign nations. The cotton acreage will have to be reduced until the equilibrium is restored.

The farmers of the West sold \$135,000,000 of surplus meat products. The breeding of cattle must be checked until our

home markets can consume the entire output. We foolishly sold \$133,000,000 of grain. The plows must be stopped. Our farmers sold \$38,000,000 of tobacco; the planting must be stopped, the equilibrium is in danger. This new statesmanship resembles the fable of the monkey dividing the cheese between the two cats [applause on the Democratic side]; if the yield of grain is heavy, let more acres lie idle; if the mills are supplied with improved machinery, employ fewer hands. But whose lands are to lie idle and whose mills are to be closed down in order to maintain this sacred equilibrium? Who is to be the monkey and who will consent to be the cats? I do not know what the people of Maine think of such wisdom, but in Indiana the whole scheme would be called monkey business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We grow a surplus of farm products beyond any possible needs of our population. The latest report of the Department of Agriculture says this is true back as far as inquiry has been made. We grow more grain and mature more meat than our Nation can consume. In 1910 we exported \$286,728,126 in value of grains and meats from our farms. Yet we are told by some of the Members of this House who practice law in the great cities and who see the farms from an automobile or car window that reciprocity will ruin the farmer. What is the effect of the export trade on prices? Mr. Armour, in his work, "The Packers and the People," says:

It is the export business that absorbs the surplus live stock grown by American cattlemen and farmers and steadies and supports the home markets for live stock. If this export business were taken away or even reduced, the effects of it would be directly felt by every farmer who raises a steer, sheep, or hog for market.

This testimony by Armour is fully sustained by Mr. Holmes, Chief of Division of Foreign Markets, Department of Agriculture. In Bulletin No. 55, speaking of the influence of our exports of meat products on domestic markets, Mr. Holmes says:

If such an immense quantity of surplus meat food were to be confined within this country by the refusal of foreign countries to buy it, there would follow consequences to farmer, rangeman, slaughterer, and packer which would be financially disastrous.

Mr. Saunders knew these facts, and without ever a thought of restoring an equilibrium by limiting our production, and thus destroying industry and the national wealth and income, he proposed to enlarge our foreign markets and thus encourage and stimulate industry and increase our national wealth and income.

There are but the two ways of maintaining an equilibrium between agriculture and manufacture. The gentleman from Maine proposes to restrict the agricultural acreage to an artificial basis, and thereby decrease production. The member of the President's Tariff Board would increase our markets so as to stimulate industry and increase our national wealth. The choice between these two theories is really a choice between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection. Our prohibitive tariff laws prevent the people of continental Europe from selling to us, and in retaliation they prohibit us from selling our agricultural products to them. This reduces the competition in the markets where the farmer sells and also prevents competition in the markets where he is compelled to buy. This naturally reduces selling prices and increases buying prices to the farmers of our country. This destroys the equilibrium between manufacture and agriculture, from the farmer's viewpoint, and is the condition which the American farmer is most anxious to remove.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. With pleasure.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if the Hinds theory of economics is followed and the restriction of the agricultural products of this country is limited to what the manufacturers take, if that would not have a tendency to reduce very materially the value of farm lands in the upper Mississippi Valley, and, in fact, the value of lands that are suitable for agriculture generally?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. There can be no question in the world of that, Mr. Chairman. It is high prices for the products of the farm that make high-priced land. To reduce the total income of all the farms of the United States is to reduce the value of these farms, because if you were to destroy entirely their productive capacity you will have destroyed their selling value.

Do you wonder that the farmer is in deadly earnest about reciprocity and that he has been the real leader in the great educational movement which has grown strong enough to overthrow the Republican majority in this House and which promises to make Democratic success nearly certain in 1912? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This national conference of agricultural organizations was the beginning of a new era in our political world; it was the genesis of that spirit of insurgency which has since become so

rampant in both political parties that Gov. Woodrow Wilson is quoted as saying:

The only essentials in American politics to-day is the difference between the progressives and the reactionaries. We have in the last 10 years come out of the merely negative in politics.

That great movement to center public thought on measures of legislation and not upon the party organization to which any man may belong goes back to that day when the farmers of this Nation declared that legislation was not a question of Republicanism or of Democracy, but of the enactment of laws, and they will not soon forget that fundamental truth. This great conference was attended by more than 600 delegates, representing every principal agricultural organization in the Nation. I will print in connection with my remarks a complete list of these organizations. From the State of Indiana were the Farmers' Congress, Society of Equity, Angus Breeders' Association, Live Stock Exchange, and State board of agriculture, and at the close of its session the following resolution was passed:

That we recommend that a permanent organization be formed under the style of the Reciprocal Tariff League, and that a committee of 15 be appointed by the Chair with full power to organize and further the work for which this convention was assembled.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to follow this movement further; it is an active, virile force in our body politic, molding public sentiment, breaking down slavery to party organization, and creating a commendable spirit of independence among the voters of our country. It was significant that at the very moment when this great convention was sitting in Chicago trying to secure better foreign markets for our food products that 2,000 butchers and meat dealers in Germany were holding a still greater convention to demand that the Fatherland should open up the frontier and permit importations of American cattle, so that the German workman might have meat on his table. What a strange situation. The farmers of America willing to sell and the workmen of Germany eager to buy; we desirous to trade a small portion of our surplus food for a small proportion of their surplus manufactures, so that the people of both countries should be better fed and better clothed, because labor in both countries will be better rewarded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes additional to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to interrupt the gentleman, but I wish to ask the date of that convention.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It is August, 1906. I can give the gentleman the exact date.

This beneficent result is prevented by a prohibitive tariff system in both countries, behind which the industrial trusts and combinations of this country are sheltered and from which the landowners of Germany secure equal freedom from competition. Thus we have the swollen fortunes and idle rich nourished and sustained in republic and empire by the same methods of legislation.

The gentleman from Maine was again unfortunate when he applied his celebrated theory of equilibrium to the agriculture of Germany and England. It seems that he had read a book on agriculture written by a railroad man [applause on the Democratic side], and after comparing it with his home-market theory he established the following facts about equilibriums:

As we turn from England and her sad picture we find another story in Germany and France, where statesmen and people united to preserve the equilibrium of the home market.

As his whole argument rests on equilibriums, I am going to call a witness as to the conditions actually existing in the markets of England and Germany. I am not going to summon a railroad man, but will call on a member of President Taft's Tariff Board. I shall quote from a signed article written by A. H. Saunders while he was in England and published August 5, 1908. The article states that he was in personal attendance at the markets in question. Mr. Saunders says:

The English are the best-fed people in the world. Their ports are open to the food supplies of all nations.

That is the picture that a member of our Tariff Board draws of the English people—that they are the best-fed people in the world. Now, what splendid condition did he find in France and Germany to contrast with this picture? He says:

But a few hours distant by steam across the English Channel there are millions of people who scarcely know the taste of a good rib or loin of beef. What little beef there is on sale is mostly lean and tough. No wonder horseflesh sells readily alongside of it. No wonder that the canine and feline creations are called on to make good the dearth of good bovine supplies.

Now, that is another way of keeping up the equilibrium in the home markets. The Germans can kill dogs and cats to supply the beef which they have not got and can not get. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the gentleman from Maine says that

this proud position of the German farmer is due to the wisdom of Bismarck, who investigated and then acted, instead of acting first and then investigating. The record shows that this sentiment was applauded by the membership of this House on his side of the aisle. What does Mr. Saunders, of our Tariff Board, say is causing this condition of the German Nation? He omits to mention the wisdom and statesmanship of Bismarck, but says that—

Continental parliaments are in the grip of the landed proprietors, who prefer to see a virtual meat famine among the laboring people and classes, with cattle and hogs selling at 12 to 15 cents per pound, live weight, rather than to consent to the relaxation of the rigid rules and high tariffs by which foreign-grown foodstuffs are excluded.

After this signed article had been published in the Breeders' Gazette an Iowa farmer wanted to know the "true cause" why America and Germany could not get together on a trade agreement. Mr. Saunders replied as follows:

The true reason is the effective opposition up to date of people who are profiting largely by the status quo—plethoric German agrarians on the one hand and certain well-fed interests on the other. The former are very active in the German Parliament and the latter in the American Congress.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Since the publication of this report many a Republican Congressman has failed to maintain his equilibrium at the ballot box. I commend these reports to the gentleman from Maine when he begins a revision of his theory of equilibriums of the home market.

Agriculture is the basis of our national wealth, and to make this foundation secure for the future generations we must conserve the fertility of our soil. Every bushel of grain which we sell abroad reduces our national wealth to the extent of the loss of plant food which produces that product. We can not go on forever selling our raw grains to be fed on foreign soils, because you can not take away from the land without making a return to the land. Grain farming encourages soil erosion and thus lowers or destroys the life-sustaining power of the soil in two ways—by washing away of the soil particles and by a loss of the chemical elements which produce the growth of plants. In both of these directions our losses are appalling. It is estimated that 1,000,000,000 tons of soil washes from American farms and is carried to the sea by our rivers every year. The waters of the Potomac are never clear, and the mighty current of the Mississippi can not carry its burden of silt to the sea. Our farmers are spending millions of dollars for fertilizers every year, and the tax is an ever-increasing one. We need to have no fear of an increasing population if we can only avoid a decreasing soil fertility. For this reason alone it is wise statesmanship to extend our markets for finished food products rather than to stand paralyzed with fear of competition in raw grains. The best farmer in any community is he who sells his products in their most concentrated form and who saves his by-products to increase the fertility of his lands. This means that the progressive farmer is in reality a manufacturer. His grains, his grass, and his hay are only raw products; his eggs, his cream, butter, and live stock are his finished products. Under this system of agriculture it is possible to return 90 per cent of the fertility to the soil, and by a scientific rotation of crops maintain the fertility of the soil for all future time, and thus insure the future prosperity of our Nation. This is not possible under any known system of grain farming. The opponents of reciprocity are laying much stress on the possible competition in wheat.

Our experiment station in Indiana sent a wheat train over our State last fall to demonstrate that wheat is now grown at a loss in Indiana under our present methods. Every farmer knows this to be true, but his only remedy is to turn to increased live-stock farming if he would increase his yields of wheat. Intensive farming would double the present output of our farms. This would add billions of dollars to our national income every year. If some method of extracting annually a billion of dollars from the rocks of our hills could be discovered it would usher in a golden era in the life of our Nation; yet this is a small sum compared to the possible increase in the annual output of our farms; but intense agriculture is impossible, except as it may be based on live-stock industry. There is thus a direct relation between our prohibitive tariff system and our crude agriculture, which is so rapidly exhausting the fertility of our farms and thus depleting our national wealth. We can not go to intense farming without stimulating our live-stock industry; we can not increase our live stock, because we can not sell our meat products in the markets of Continental Europe; and we can not sell in their markets, because we prohibit them from selling in ours. Thus our prohibitive tariff really forms a vicious circle, which is reducing the fertility of our soil, driving the boys from the farms, and is rapidly chang-

ing us from an agricultural nation to a manufacturing nation. Our present high-tariff system is thus actually destroying the tillage of the soil as the most desirable occupation among men, to which all other occupations should be subsidiary.

The gentlemen on the other side of this question are preparing to appeal to the farmers for support at the ballot box. I welcome the test. It has been said that there must be a national revolt against the worship of manufactures and trade as the only forms of progressive activity among our people. Mr. Chairman, this revolt has come and it will be sustained by the deliberate judgment of farmers, whose labors are the very fountain from which all other occupations flow and by which they are nourished and fed. [Loud applause.]

The following is a complete list of all agricultural and livestock associations which appointed delegates to the national reciprocity conference in Chicago:

National Live Stock Association, American Stock Growers' Association, American Shorthorn Breeders' Association, American Hereford Cattle Breeders' Association, American Polled-Durham Breeders' Association, American Aberdeen-Angus Breeders' Association, American Galloway Breeders' Association, National Polled-Hereford Breeders' Association, Holstein-Friesian Breeders' Association, Ayrshire Breeders' Association, American Clydesdale Association, American Percheron Horse Breeders' Association, French Coach-Horse Society of America, American Saddle-Horse Breeders' Association, Aldie Horse Breeders' Association, American Shetland Pony Club, American Suffolk Horse Association, American Shropshire Sheep Association, American Oxford Down Association, American Suffolk Flock Registry, Dorset Horn Sheep Association, Hampshire Down Breeders' Association of America, the Continental Dorset Club, American Cheviot Sheep Society, American Milch Goat Record Association, Southwest Poland China Record Association, American Yorkshire Association, American Poland China Record Association, American Berkshire Association, National Duroc-Jersey Record Association, Improved Stock Breeders' Association of the Wheat Belt, Cattle Growers' Association of Texas, Indiana Aberdeen-Angus Breeders' Association, Corn-Belt Meat Producers' Association, Wisconsin Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Cattle Growers' Association of New Mexico, Ohio Wool Growers' Association, Ohio Horse Breeders' Association, Oklahoma Improved Breeders' Association, North Dakota Live Stock Association, Pennsylvania Live Stock Association, Kentucky Live Stock Association, Rock County (Minn.) Breeders' Association, Western Live Stock Protective Association, Southeast Missouri Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Southeastern Stock Growers' Association, Shorthorn Breeders' Association of Southeast Virginia, Platte Valley Live Stock Association, North Missouri Combination Cattle Sales Association, Fountain County Hereford Breeders & Feeders' Association, Ray County Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Central Missouri Hereford Breeders' Association, Marion County Improved Live Stock Association, McLean County Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Keokuk County Polled-Durham Breeders' Association, Chicago Live Stock Exchange, Cleveland Live Stock Exchange, East Buffalo Stock Exchange, Indianapolis Stock Exchange, Kansas City Stock Exchange, Louisville Stock Exchange, Milwaukee Stock Exchange, Omaha Stock Exchange, Peoria Stock Exchange, Pittsburg Stock Exchange, St. Joseph Stock Exchange, St. Louis Stock Exchange, Sioux City Stock Exchange, South St. Paul Stock Exchange, Cattle & Horse Growers' Association of Colorado, Indiana State Board of Agriculture, Illinois State Board of Agriculture, Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture, Minnesota State Board of Agriculture, Iowa State Board of Agriculture, Nebraska State Board of Agriculture, West Michigan State Fair Association, Wisconsin Farmers' Institute, Minnesota Farmers' Institute, Illinois Farmers' Institute, Illinois Farmers' Institute of the Third Congressional District, American Society of Equity, Illinois Seed-Corn Growers' Association, Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, Rob Roy Union American Society of Equity, Cotton Growers' Protective Association, Farmers' National Congress, Kansas Corn Breeders' Association, St. Louis Cotton Exchange, California Fruit Growers' Association, and International Apple Shippers' Association.

Delegations appointed by governors of States:

Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to yield time now?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, before doing that I would like to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to ask considerable time to discuss this measure, but I have received a telegram this morning which will carry me to the State of Kentucky at 2 o'clock to-day, and therefore I shall have a few things to say upon this subject at this time.

This is my first term in Congress. I am inexperienced in tariff legislation; and since the tariff is the paramount issue before the American people between the two dominant political parties in this country, and since the ripened judgment and matured statesmanship of both parties have for years struggled in vain to arrive at any satisfactory settlement of this vexed question, you can readily realize with what trepidation I approach the discussion of any phase of this great problem.

I was opposed to Canadian reciprocity and voted against that measure. After that bill had passed this House, after the farmers' products of our country had through its provisions been exposed to unjust discrimination and injury, both at home and abroad, I had hoped that the farmers' free-list bill, now under discussion, would be presented to this House in such a form as that I could give it my hearty support.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to give some of the reasons why I voted against the reciprocity pact with Canada, and later some reasons why I would gladly support this so-called farmers' free-list bill, if it were modified in such a way as to strip it of at least some of its unjust and unfair provisions.

In my judgment, the high cost of living in this country gave birth to the reciprocity treaty with Canada. It was in the hope of reducing the cost of living and relieving the masses of that burden that the reciprocity measure had its origin. Stripped of all disguise, that was, and is, both its aim and object. The President intimated so much in his measure of January 26 last, when he said:

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

The President was, and is, sincere in his belief that the cost of living in this country is too high and that the great mass of the American people demand a reduction therein.

The Democratic Party, with its ear to the ground and with the hope of ingratiating itself with the American electorate, coupled with a desire, I grant, of being responsive to the public will, came forward as the chief champion and defender of this measure emanating from a Republican President. It is true that the cost of living is too high. I am also free to say that there is a just popular demand for a reduction in prices; but I shall not agree that the farmer should be the hack horse and the burden bearer of these blessings to the rest of humanity. If corn is too high, so is clothing; if potatoes are too high, so is rice and sugar. If cattle are too high, so is beef. If wheat is too high, so is flour. If hogs are too high, so is pork. If the raw materials which the farmer produces and has to sell, are put upon the free list under this bill, why are not the products made out of the raw materials which the farmer produces likewise put upon the free list? Why is the farmer forced to sell his wheat in a free market and then buy back the flour made from that wheat in a protected market? Why protect the manufacturer of flour at the expense of the farmer? If the farmer's cattle and hogs are put upon the free list, why have not beef and pork likewise been put upon the free list? Why protect the great Beef and Pork Trusts at the expense of the farmer? Why protect the trust products and leave the farmer's products unprotected? If the rye and oats which the farmer raises are too high, so is the hat which he wears upon his head and the shoes he wears upon his feet likewise too high. Why have not they been put upon the free list in this bill? You have put upon the protected list the things which the farmer buys; why do you leave off of the protected list the things which he sells? The things which the farmer buys, no less than the things which the farmer sells, go to make up the cost of living.

Under this reciprocity agreement the tariff duty of 25 cents per bushel has been removed from the wheat which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents per barrel has been retained on the flour which the farmer buys. In other words, the great flour mills of Canada are given the opportunity of buying from our farmers their wheat free and then selling to our farmers the flour made from their own free wheat with a protection of 50 cents per barrel.

Under this Canadian pact a tariff duty of 10 cents per bushel has been removed from the oats which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents a hundred pounds has been retained on the oatmeal and rolled oats made out of the oats bought of the farmer free.

Is it right for the Beef Trust and the great packing concerns of the country to buy free live stock from the farmer and then be protected by a duty of 1½ cents on every pound of meat which the farmer buys?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's barley and protect the brewer at the rate of 45 cents per 100 pounds?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's rye and protect the distiller at the rate of \$2.60 per gallon on the whisky made therefrom?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's corn and barley and wheat and rye and oats and tomatoes and other vegetables and protect the manufacturers of these products into articles prepared for the farmer's consumption?

Is it just and fair and right that the Beef Trust and packing concerns, the millers, the bakers, the brewers, and all the rest should be protected in what they make out of the products they buy from the farmer free?

Under this reciprocity agreement things which the farmer produces and has to sell were put upon the free list, but the things which he can not produce, but has to buy, were placed on the protected list. In other words, the manufactured products, in the main, are protected; the farmer's products, in the main, are unprotected. Both Canada and the United States,

under this agreement, propose to protect their factories, but mutually agree that the products of the farmers of both countries may enter the markets of the other free of duty. Is it right that the American manufacturer should be permitted to buy the things he consumes from the Canadian farmer free and go on selling his manufactured and protected products to the unprotected farmer of our own country? Grant that the price of living is too high; is not that which the farmer buys too high as well as that which the farmer sells? And, as a matter of fact, the farmer, in the main, is not getting an exorbitant price for the products of his farm.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his report (1911), shows that the farmer does not get 50 per cent of the price the consumer is forced to pay for agricultural products. He also points out that the prices received by farmers in many instances were even less than the cost of production; and that the middleman, and not the farmer, is the one mostly responsible for the high cost of foods. The trouble lies with the middlemen. The profits are made after the farmer's products leave him and before they reach the table of the consumer. Is there anything in the reciprocity pact designed to remedy this evil? Nothing. Should the farmer be singled out as a victim and made the burden bearer for all other classes? In an effort to reduce the cost of living should the farmer's pocketbook be the only pocketbook called upon to contribute to that end? But the argument has been made here by gentlemen on this floor that the reciprocity agreement with Canada will reduce the cost of living and at the same time will not affect the price of farm products. Since it is conceded by the President, the author of the reciprocity agreement with Canada, that the agreement will chiefly affect the products of the farm, and since the farmer's products are the ones put upon the free list in this bill, it is beyond my conception to understand how the cost of living is going to be reduced without reducing the cost of farm products, and it is equally incomprehensible to me how the farmer's products are going to be reduced in price and the farmer profited thereby. How it is going to help the farmer to sell what he has got to sell in a low market and buy what he has got to buy in a high market is a problem the solution of which the champions of this measure will have to solve, for they solemnly tell us that the farmer is going to be blessed and benefited by the transaction and that he should welcome the day when he sells cheap and buys high.

Canada has a population of about 7,500,000 people; the United States has a population of over 92,000,000. In other words, the United States has about twelve times as many inhabitants as Canada. The advocates of this bill tell us that it is going to be a blessed privilege on the part of the farmer of this country to have the glorious (?) opportunity of selling his farm products to one Canadian in return for the privilege on the part of the one Canadian to sell his farm products to 12 Americans. In other words, that the farmers of this country should welcome the day when they have the right, without tariff interference, to at least partially stop selling their products to 12 Americans in exchange for the privilege of selling them to one Canadian.

Republican protection has built up for our farmers a market here on American soil amounting to \$25,000,000,000 a year, and it is now proposed by Canadian reciprocity to turn that over to the Canadian farmer free. We are told that even if our American farmer should get no market of any consequence for the one he gives up, and even if he is forced to sell his products into a foreign market at a reduced price, and even if the Canadian farmers have contributed nothing to build our bridges and roads and churches and schools, or to maintain or keep up our institutions, that the American farmer should look upon this Canadian agreement from a "high plane"; that the things I have just mentioned are sordid considerations; that Canada is our neighbor, and that free intercourse with a neighbor nation is a lofty sentiment and one which should control our actions in this matter. In answer to that argument I want to say that this reciprocity pact with Canada is not a matter of sentiment, but a matter of business; it is a transaction involving the welfare of the American farmer, and the American, not the Canadian, farmer is the one entitled to our sympathy if there is any sentiment at all in this proposed agreement.

Most of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have been loud in their praise of the reciprocity pact, because it is a free-trade measure, they say; or, to say the least of it, "a long step in the direction of free trade"; and with that statement I fully agree. This pact is a good deal more than a reciprocal agreement with Canada. It is not a pact for the purpose of exchanging with Canada what we have for what she has not, or what she has for what we have not. It is putting our farm products in open competition with the farm products of Canada. It is not reciprocity; it is free trade. If our farmers are to be exposed to free trade with Canada, why should not our manufacturers be exposed to free trade with Canada? If

free trade with Canada is a good thing for the American farmer and the American people generally, why is not free trade with the world a good thing for the American farmer and the American people generally?

I can understand why the Democratic Representatives in this House and the Democratic Party of the Nation seized the opportunity to pass the Canadian reciprocity measure. It was not mainly for the purpose of enlarging our trade with Canada and securing the Canadian market, for we already have that. We now have 60 per cent of Canada's entire foreign trade.

The reason why the Democratic Party embraced with such undisguised delight the opportunity to pass the Canadian pact was that it is a heavy blow to the time-honored doctrine of Republican protection. In fact, it is in many respects a radical free-trade measure. It does not stop with the "tariff for revenue only" doctrine of the Democratic Party. It does not look to revenue at all. Its most earnest advocates admit that we will lose from two to ten million dollars in revenues yearly by reason of the passage of this bill. It would not surprise me if we lost yearly \$50,000,000 in revenue.

The central idea in the fertile brains of the Democratic Members of this House, and the motive which actuated their hearts in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity measure, were to strike a body blow to our protective system.

They are not unmindful of the fact that our protective tariff system is a logical whole; that protection must either apply to all industries or apply to none. You can not protect the manufacturers and leave the farmer unprotected. Protection must protect everybody that needs protection or protect nobody.

I have made these observations, Mr. Chairman, explanatory of my vote on the Canadian reciprocity measure and preparatory to a few observations I am now going to make on what is called the farmers' free-list bill now pending before this House.

As I have intimated heretofore, I had hoped to be able to give what some are pleased to call the farmers' free-list bill my hearty support. As an original proposition I would have opposed it in whatever form presented. What I mean to say is, that if the Canadian reciprocity bill had not passed this House and if this misnamed farmers' free-list bill had been introduced as an original proposition, and not as an intended balm (supposed in the minds of some to rehabilitate the status of and compensate for the injury done) the American farmer by the passage of the reciprocity bill, I would have cast my vote against it because of its free-trade provisions. That this measure is a blow at our protective system no one doubts or denies, and that the United States owes her greatness, in a great measure at least, to our protective policy is the belief of many of her citizens.

The truth is that the protective system has been the generally accepted economic policy of the United States. For years our people have been divided as to the amount of protection and about just what should be protected and what should not be protected; but few of our people have been open advocates of free trade. The Republican Party has stood for such duties on imported articles (coming in competition with our own) as would furnish protection to American capital and American labor. The Democratic Party has stood for such rates of duty on imported articles as would furnish us sufficient revenues to run the Government when economically administered, apparently without regard to the effect on American capital and American labor. The "insurgent" and "stand-pat" Republicans differ on matters here and there, but all stand for some sort of protection and none for free trade. The tariff is essentially a selfish question. The Democrats want a tariff for revenue only. The Republicans want a tariff not only for revenue, but a tariff so levied as will protect American capital and American labor. Most everybody wants a tariff levied on the products of foreign countries coming into our own country, in order to raise sufficient revenues to defray the necessary expenses of this great Government. We differ as to just how to get this money; but all agree that it is much to our liking to get it from the pockets of the foreigner, if we can, rather than to take it out of our own. And here at home I find that our views as individuals are much warped by how tariff duties, or the lack of them, on this article or that are going to affect us. The Middle West and their Representatives here, or the most of them, want free lumber and protection on agricultural products. Why? Because they produce the one and do not produce the other. They want to buy as cheap and sell as high as they can. The lumber-producing districts want protection on lumber and would like to see farm products on the free list. Why? Because they want to sell what they have to sell as high as they can and buy what they have got to buy as cheap as they can. The New England manufacturer is interested in having protection on the product he manufactures and apparently would take quite a delight, some of them, in buying products of the farm from the farmer free.

It has been wisely said that the tariff question is a local question, and the author of that saying could have added, with equal truth, "and a selfish question." The tariff will have to stand as a whole, or it can not stand at all.

The Democrats, through their representatives here, have put the products of the American farmer on the free list, so far as Canada is concerned; and Canada is our closest and most dangerous competitor. It seems to me that any unprejudiced mind must admit that great injury has been done the farmer in the passage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada. In fact, the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee, in making a report on the farmers' free-list bill, admitted that the American farmer was getting the worst of it in the reciprocity agreement with Canada, and urged that the farmers' free-list bill be passed to remedy that wrong. In the report just referred to this significant language is used:

In fact, action on the Canadian agreement involves the necessity of further and immediate action in removing a number of duties on imports from other countries, in order that justice may be done to the great army of our agricultural producers.

The Democratic Party knows that the American farmer has been unfairly dealt with in putting his products in open competition with the products of the Canadian farmer. Canada is a new and undeveloped country, with matchless possibilities and unbounded resources.

It seems that many, if not most, Americans realize this fact, for in the year 1909, \$304,000,000 belonging to enterprising inhabitants of the United States were invested in the Dominion of Canada, most of it being put in mines and timber and timber lands.

Ninety thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine residents of the United States left this country in the year 1899 and made their future homes in Canada. North Dakota furnished 16,000 of this number, while Minnesota and the State of Washington each furnished over 11,000.

Canada, in 1910, produced 95,000,000 bushels of wheat available for export. Her total yield that year was 166,744,000 bushels. She, therefore, produced twice as much as she needed for her own consumption, and actually exported that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, much of it coming to the United States. In that same year the United States exported only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat. This gives some idea of what Canada will do along this line when her 8,000,000 people reach the 92,000,000 point, which we boast of possessing in this country.

The Canadian wheat lands, of which there are 30,000,000 acres in the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan alone, average, when in cultivation, 22 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the average yield of the United States is only 15 bushels per acre. Experts say that Canada is capable of producing as much wheat yearly as is now produced in the United States.

Canada exported to the United States in 1908 \$2,582,001 worth of live stock, cattle, hogs, sheep, and horses. In 1909 Canada shipped to the United States \$1,847,836 worth of breadstuffs, wheat, rye, beans, and so forth. In the same year she shipped \$382,118,000 worth of provisions—beef, cheese, eggs, and so forth—to the United States.

In the year 1909 Canada produced \$2,912,509 worth of hogs, \$2,705,390 worth of sheep, and \$7,234,085 worth of cattle. In the same year she produced 55,398,000 bushels of barley, 166,744,000 bushels of wheat, and 353,466,000 bushels of oats. The total field crops of Canada in 1909 were valued at \$552,992,100. In the year 1908 Canada stood tenth among the nations of the world as a wheat producer, and in 1909, one year later, she held the fifth position.

These figures show something of Canada's capacity along agricultural lines and something of her danger to us as a competitor in agricultural products.

For these and other reasons I voted against the reciprocity agreement with Canada and did what I could to avert its passage, believing that great harm and injury would result to the American farmer by reason thereof. But since that bill has passed this House, since the Democratic Party has, through its passage, made this onslaught on the farmers of our country—about one-sixth of our population—in the interest of "cheaper food," and since our farmers are, as far as Canada is concerned, forced to sell the products of their farms in a free market and buy the things they have got to buy in a protected market, I repeat that I much regret that the farmers' free-list bill, now soon to be voted on here, has, what appears to me, so many unwise and unfair provisions in it.

If this free-list bill had been one to benefit and not merely appease the American farmer, it would have had my hearty support. If it had been a bill really to help the American farmer and not to make political capital at his and others' expense, it would have had on the floor of this House no advocate more earnest than I, although, as I have said, I would have been against it as an original proposition.

Now, let us look at some of the provisions of this so-called farmers' free-list bill. It provides that "plows, tooth harrows, disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-drawn, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, farm wagons, farm carts, and all other agricultural implements—whatever that may mean—of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts, * * * shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States."

The gentlemen on the opposite side of this Chamber maintain that they propose to pass this bill in the interest of the American farmer. That being their avowed purpose, it would be well to look dispassionately at the situation and see whether or not this portion of the bill, if passed, will redound to the benefit of the farmers of our country, and to what extent, if any. If this part of the bill, when passed, will greatly benefit our farmers, then it ought to receive the hearty support of all the Members here.

To ascertain whether or not this part of the bill, if enacted into law, will benefit our farmers, it is necessary to determine at least three things: 1. What is the present status of the articles mentioned in this part of the bill relative to tariff duties? 2. What are the prices on these various articles now, in our own country and abroad? 3. And what effect, if any, will the passage of this bill have on the price of the articles mentioned herein?

Addressing myself to the first inquiry I find under section 476 of our present tariff law, which is now in operation, that "plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-drawn, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, and so forth, shall be imported into this country free of duty," provided "no tax or duty" shall be imposed on us, "on like articles imported from the United States" into other countries, and in the event any foreign country refuses to let us ship our agricultural implements, and so forth, free of duty into it, then we charge that country 15 per cent ad valorem for shipping its like implements into this country and enjoying the privilege of our American markets.

Is there anything radically wrong about these provisions of our present tariff law? We offer to let farming implements of other countries come into this country free of duty if they will let our farming implements go into their country free of duty. Anything unfair about that? Is it right for us to give the various countries of the world a free market for their agricultural implements in this country and, in turn, be denied a free market for our agricultural market in theirs? Should we discriminate against our own industries, or any part of them, in favor of the industries of foreign countries? Should the American manufacturer, simply because he is a manufacturer, who employs well-paid American labor, be discriminated against in favor of another manufacturer, who employs cheap-paid foreign labor? Is it right that American manufacturers of agricultural implements, who employ American labor, should be forced to pay a duty on the agricultural implements which they send to other countries and let the manufacturers of agricultural implements of other countries, who employ foreign labor, send their agricultural implements into this country free of duty? Such a course discriminates against both American capital and American labor. And, besides that, it is my information that the International Harvester Co.—and which is sometimes referred to as the Agricultural Implement Trust—has manufacturing plants not only in America, but in Canada, Sweden, Russia, France, and Germany; and that agricultural implements are as cheap, or about as cheap, in America as they are elsewhere.

If that be true, and if this tariff law, which is soon to be enacted here, is to remain long in force, would it not be a wise idea for the International Harvester Co. and other concerns in the United States engaged in making farm implements to remove their plants to Canada and elsewhere and save the thousands of dollars annually which are now paid this Government in tariff duties for the privilege of shipping and selling agricultural implements into this country.

In that event this Government would not only lose the thousands of dollars paid in tariff duties, but our wage earners would lose \$50,000,000 annually now paid American labor in the manufacture of agricultural implements.

In 1905 the United States produced \$111,344,975 worth of agricultural implements. There were in the year of 1900 46,582 wage earners employed in the United States in the manufacture of agricultural implements. In that year there was \$157,707,951 of American money invested in the manufacture of these implements. The State of Kentucky alone had \$1,735,595 invested in this enterprise, and paid Kentucky wage earners over \$300,000. The State of Illinois had

\$62,202,320 invested in the manufacture of agricultural implements, and paid over \$9,000,000, exclusive of officers and clerks' salaries, to American wage earners.

To let the cheaply made agricultural implements be shipped into this country free of duty would be, indeed, an unjust and unfair discrimination against American capital and American labor, especially in view of the fact that tariff duties must be paid by us on all the agricultural implements which we send for sale to other countries.

Since agricultural implements are already as cheap in this country as elsewhere, and since we lose thousands of dollars in revenue for this Government and transfer millions of dollars from American to foreign labor, it is evident, it seems to me, that this section of the farmers' free "fake" bill if enacted into law, will hurt, not help, both the American farmer and the American people generally.

This farmers' free "fake bill" provides also "that on and after the day following the passage of this act beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed and undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner, bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compound and lard substitutes, sausage, sausage meats shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States." Before the passage of this bill I propose to introduce the following amendment:

Provided, That beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and other meats stipulated in this section of the bill, and which are produced in the United States, shall be admitted free of duty into the country or countries, dependency or dependencies, which import any of like articles into this country.

I have no idea that the amendment I will offer will pass this House. The truth is that the Democratic Representatives here have already held a caucus on this bill and have already decided that no amendment, however meritorious, shall have a chance to become incorporated into and made a part of this measure when enacted into law.

The Democrats of this House have decided that this farmers' free-list bill shall pass this House without amendment from anybody. That, however, shall not deter me from offering whatever amendments, which, if enacted into law, would, in my judgment, prove to be beneficial to the country at large, and especially the district I have the privilege and honor of representing. The Democratic Party, through its Ways and Means Committee, said in its report on the farmers' free-list bill that great injury had been done "the great army of our agricultural producers" through and by reason of the passage of the Canadian pact; that "the advantages of the agreement are greater for the people of Canada than for the people of our own country"; and hence the introduction of the farmers' free-list bill to remedy that wrong. But does it remedy it? Will this section of the farmers' free-list bill, which removes the duty on beef, mutton, pork, and so forth, actually help the American farmer—the American producer?

We produced in this country, in the year 1905, \$760,764,477 worth of fresh and preserved meats, while only \$477,755 worth was imported into this country from other countries for consumption.

In the year 1910 we produced in this country in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000 worth of fresh and preserved meats, while only \$736,165 worth were imported into this country from other countries for consumption and on which \$159,865 in duties were paid to us by foreign countries. But they tell us if we will let foreign meats come into this country free of duty that we can well afford to lose \$159,865 yearly in duties paid to this country, because they say that if we permit free meats to come to this country it will greatly reduce the price of meats and therefore the cost of living.

If it be true, as contended by Democratic Representatives here, that the importation of meats into this country from foreign countries free of duty will greatly reduce the price of meats, and therefore the cost of living, on whom, I ask, will this burden of reduced cost of meats fall? The American farmer raises cattle and hogs and sheep, and so forth, from which beef and pork and mutton, and so forth, are produced. Now, if the price of beef and pork and mutton, and so forth, are greatly reduced, will not the price of cattle and hogs and sheep, and so forth, be necessarily reduced and will not the American farmer be the great sufferer from this transaction?

We now have over 6,000,000 farmers in the United States, and no legislation should be enacted here or elsewhere that fails to give their interest due consideration.

The interests of the farmers and stock raisers of our country are already greatly imperiled by the importation of cheaply produced frozen meats from other countries. A number of our competitors in such meats are the countries of Canada, New Zealand, Argentina, Australia, Mexico, and other countries, which produce much more of meats than they consume and are already exporting largely to other countries.

Canada, three years ago, shipped \$11,000,000 worth of cattle, on the hoof, to Europe; five years ago we shipped \$22,000,000 worth of meats to Europe; and last year we shipped only \$12,000,000 worth of meats to Europe.

The countries which I have already referred to, which are producing cheaper meat than it is in our power to produce, have already taken much of our foreign markets from us. Argentina, for instance, in 1909 sent \$32,000,000 worth of meats to Europe; New Zealand sent \$17,000,000 to Europe; other countries were and are heavy meat exporters.

The authors of this free-list bill propose to let all these other countries send their cheaply produced meats to the United States and enjoy the privilege of the American market without paying a cent duty for the privilege of doing so; and in turn our farmers and stock raisers are denied the privilege of sending their meats to other countries without paying, in many instances, heavy tariff duty thereon. But we are told that even if the American farmer does have to sell his farm products cheaper, and, especially his meat products cheaper, by reason of the passage of this free-list bill, that in turn he can buy what he has to buy so much cheaper by reason thereof that he will in the end be greatly benefited. Let us look into that claim for a few moments and see what truth, if any, there is to that statement.

The Democratic Party has for years contended that the price of any given article to the consumer is increased by the amount of the tariff duty levied on that article. In other words, that the consumer pays the tax. I am not saying that that is true; but if it be true, as contended by the Democratic Party, let us see whether or not the American farmer will be benefited by the passage of this farmers' free-list bill. Taking the ad valorem rate of duty in the year 1909 on the articles mentioned in this farmers' free-list bill, which the farmer has to buy, and the farmers' consumption of these articles herein in the year 1905—the only one on which I now have the figures at my command—I find that the farmers of our country under the Democratic theory would save \$93,869,914 in buying manufactured articles and other things he has to buy which are enumerated in this free-list bill. But while that is true, the same process of calculation shows that the farmers of this country would lose each year \$292,618,285 by the reduction in prices of farm products, or a total loss of \$198,758,371, or \$33.12 annually to every farmer.

TABLE 1.—Showing supposed reduction to farmers in manufactured products which the farmer buys, included in H. R. 4413, which is the farmers' free-list bill.

Articles.	Consumption of article in United States 1905.	Ad valorem duty 1910.	Supposed reduction in price.	Farmers' part of reduction.
Agricultural implements.....	\$90,637,110	20	\$18,127,422	\$18,127,422
Bagging for cotton sacks, burlaps, etc.....	26,031,614	28	7,288,851	7,288,851
Cotton ties (hoop or band iron).....	12,639,933	35	4,541,373	4,541,373
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc.....	493,005,263	7	33,510,366	11,170,112
Barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc.....	113,027,205	28	31,647,617	31,647,617
Lumber, laths, and shingles.....	699,599,293	8	55,963,979	18,654,659
Sewing machines and parts of.....	8,497,464	30	2,549,239	849,746
Salt.....	9,540,827	50	4,770,412	1,590,134
Total annual gain to farmers.....				\$93,869,914
Average annual gain to each farmer.....				15.64

In the above table I have assumed that farmers will get the benefit of all the reduction in prices of farm implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, and barbed and other wire for fencing. But leather, boots and shoes, lumber, sewing machines, and salt are used by all classes of citizens. I have therefore assumed that the farmers would consume one-third of these articles, and hence should be credited with only one-third of the reduction in the cost of these articles.

TABLE 2.—Showing supposed reduction in price of articles manufactured from farm products, which the farmer sells, included in H. R. 4413, which would be a loss to the farmers.

Articles.	Consumption of article in United States 1905.	Ad valorem duty 1910.	Supposed reduction in price.	Per capita to each farmer.
Fresh and preserved meats.....	\$614,895,219	23	\$152,959,564	25.47
Flour and grits, cereals and bread.....	665,041,533	21	139,658,721	23.27
Total annual loss to farmers.....			292,618,285	48.74
Average annual loss to each farmer.....				48.74

In other words, by taking the Democratic contention and figures which I have referred to, it is shown that by the passage of this bill there will be a total loss annually to the farmers of the United States of \$198,758,371, or each farmer will incur a net loss of \$33.12 yearly.

We exported, in 1910, \$106,844,808 worth of fresh and preserved meats to other countries, American markets having first been supplied by the products of the American farmer, all except \$736,165 worth of meats, which were shipped into this country from other countries.

Now, it is proposed by the framers of this bill not only to turn over the entire annual American market of about \$1,000,000,000 free to all the countries of the world, with a loss in revenue of over \$200,000 annually, but at the same time to force us to pay a tariff duty on all the meats, and so forth, we export to other countries.

Under this arrangement all the other countries of the world can have the benefit of the American market without paying a copper for the privilege of selling their meats, and so forth, in this country; but when we seek a market in which to sell our surplus, then we have to pay for it in the shape of tariff duties.

The amendment I have referred to and which I propose to offer will remedy this evil will at least force foreign countries that make us pay a duty for the privilege of selling our meats, and so forth, in their markets likewise pay a duty to us for the privilege of selling their meats, and so forth, in our markets. It is not fair nor just nor right to furnish free markets to the world and in turn be denied by the world free markets for our products.

I will not attempt to discuss at length the leather, boot, and shoe schedule in this bill. The truth is that the American shoe worker is paid from 35 to 90 per cent more for wages than the foreign shoe worker, but he does more work and better work than his laborers in other countries.

Our present tariff of 10 per cent on shoes made of bovine and calf and 15 per cent on shoes made from other leather fall far short of equalizing the wages paid in foreign countries, which, excepting England, have practically a prohibitive duty. In Canada it is 30 per cent; France, 57 to 95 cents per pair; Belgium, 27 cents per pound; Germany, 25 per cent; Austria, 20 cent per kilo; Japan, 40 per cent, and so on.

If the tariff duty of from 10 to 15 per cent which is now in operation in this country is wiped out, as is proposed in this bill, without requiring a similar concession from other countries, it puts both American capital and American labor at great disadvantage.

According to the last Government report, the United States pays her boot and shoe employees an average of \$38.33 per month, or five times as much as they are paid in some of the foreign countries.

Tan bark is used in the manufacture of shoes from hides of cattle, and so forth. We produce in the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky a good deal of tan bark, and if the boot and shoe industry of the United States is crippled, it will greatly cripple that industry in the district I have the honor to represent, injuring both the laborers and owners of tan bark, as well as those owning the timber from which tan bark is taken.

There is another provision in this farmers' free-list bill which ought to defeat its passage. The section of the bill to which I refer provides that—

Timber, hewed, sided, or squared, or round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, etc.—

Shall be—

exempt from duty when imported into the United States.

We produced in the United States in the year 1910 \$724,705,760 worth of lumber, laths, and shingles, and we exported in that same year to other countries \$47,504,809 worth of lumber, laths, and shingles. The lumber has been and is yet one of our big industries. At one time the United States was the greatest timber country in the world to its size. There was a time when the forests of the United States covered 850,000,000 acres. It is claimed that we have left something near 550,000,000 acres of timber lands, but great inroads have been made upon the supply of valuable timber in all parts of this country.

We now take from our forests yearly 20,000,000,000 cubic feet of wood, 90,000,000 cords of firewood, 40,000,000 feet of lumber board measure, 118,000,000 hewn ties, and a billion and a half of staves, besides immense quantities of lumber used in other ways, and it is a heavy drain upon the forests of our country.

In my judgment a pretty hard blow was struck at the lumber business of the United States in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity agreement, although a duty of 10 cents per 1,000 pieces was retained on laths, and a duty of 30 cents per 1,000 pieces was retained on shingles, and a duty of 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure, was retained on "sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber planed or finished on one side." It is true, of course, under the reciprocity agreement, that "sawed boards, planks, and other lumber not otherwise manufactured than sawed," as well as "timber hewn, sided, or squared, otherwise than by sawing," and so forth, were put upon the free list with Canada, but not with the rest of the world. In other words, rough lumber, in the main, was put upon the free list with Canada under the reciprocity pact, while lumber partly or at all manufactured was not. But under this free-list bill lumber of all kinds, except mahogany, rosewood, and a few others, are put upon the free list. Shingles and laths were put upon the free list, and while Canada can now ship shingles and laths into this country free of duty, we will have to pay a duty for the privilege of shipping our shingles and laths into Canada.

In lumber, shingles, laths, and so forth, our northern neighbor, Canada, "the lady of the snows," is our closest and most dangerous competitor.

Canada is a vast country in area, containing 700,000 square miles more territory than the United States, leaving out Alaska. It is a country largely undeveloped, with boundless resources. Take British Columbia, for example. That Province possesses the largest compact area of merchantable timber anywhere to be found in the whole of North America. The truth is that western Canada will soon be furnishing lumber for a large part of the world's requirements. The lumber produced in British Columbia now finds a market all over the world, large quantities of it being shipped into the United States.

The Province of Ontario produced \$24,399,077 worth of lumber in 1909; the Province of Quebec produced \$10,838,608 worth the same year; while other Provinces in Canada rushed the grand total up to \$54,439,036. In the same year Canada produced over \$1,000,000 worth of laths and over \$3,000,000 worth of shingles.

In the month of October, 1909, Canada shipped \$1,935,977 worth of planks and boards into the United States, \$244,525 worth of laths, palings, and pickets, and \$178,119 worth of shingles. If Canada can ship this much stuff into the United States in one month and pay our tariff duties on same, what may we expect now, when she has no tariff duties to pay? Lumbering will for many years be one of the chief industries of Canada. Much of her virgin forests are yet untouched by the hands of man.

To expose to the cheap-paid labor of Canada, and without tariff interference, except to our detriment, the lumber interests of this country, big and little—whether on the country farm and in the tree or at the mill and manufactured into planks, boards, or otherwise—is to me a proposition so preposterous as to merit the condemnation of every fair-minded American.

The reciprocity pact with Canada did give the lumber interest of our country a little protection in that our lumber was put upon an equal footing with Canadian lumber, except we were exposed to the cheaper paid labor of that country; but under the free-list bill, Canada has the privilege of sending practically all of her lumber to this country free of duty, while the United States can not send any of her lumber to Canada that is partly, or at all, manufactured without paying a heavy duty on same. That this is an unfair discrimination against us and in favor of Canada, as well as other countries, it seems to me, no one can either doubt or deny.

In behalf of the lumber workers (not the Lumber Trusts) and the lumber industry of the United States, and especially in the interest of the farmers of the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky, who have tracts of timber on their farms, and others engaged in the lumber industry in that district, I propose to offer an amendment to the lumber section of the farmers' free-list bill, which will provide that no country that charges us duty on our lumber, when shipped into its territory, can ship its lumber into this country free of duty.

The amendment I have prepared and which, at the proper time, I shall offer, is as follows: After the words "cabinet woods," in the section of this bill providing for no tariff to be charged or levied on lumber, and so forth, when shipped into this country, add the following:

Provided, That each and all the articles specified in this section, and produced in the United States, shall be admitted free of duty into all countries, dependency, or dependencies, which imports any of said articles into this country.

This is a fair and just amendment—one that ought to pass this House. No country that charges us a duty for the privilege

of shipping and selling our lumber, and so forth, into its market should be permitted the privilege of shipping and selling its lumber here, in our market, free of duty.

I feel sure that the amendment I have offered will not pass this House. No amendment offered by any Republican will pass this House, because the Democratic majority here have determined to pass this bill without amendment; but I want to enter my protest against its unfair provisions. There are some things in the free-list bill I would be glad to vote for, and would vote for, if presented separately and not coupled with such unfair provisions as the lumber and meat schedules, for instance.

If the southern rice planters and sugar growers or producers are to have the privilege of buying free lumber, those who own timber up in my district, or engaged in its manufacture, would like to have the privilege of buying free rice and free sugar from their neighbors in the South, who are permitted to buy their lumber free.

In the year 1910 there were \$79,000,000 worth of beet and cane sugar produced in the United States, and in the same year our neighbors to the south produced 1,000,000,000 pounds of rice. Why did not the framers of this farmers' free-list bill put rice and sugar on the free list? Its authors put ground meal and wheat flour on the free list. They are produced in my district and in the North and West, but lemons, oranges, grapefruit, and rice and rice flour, which are produced in the South, are left on the protected list. Did the framers of this bill put lumber and ground meal and wheat flour, and so forth, on the free list because they are produced in certain sections of the United States, and leave sugar and rice and rice flour and lemons and oranges, and so forth, on the protected list because they are produced in certain other sections of this country—certain Democratic sections of this country?

This is the first time in 16 years that the Democratic Party has had a majority of Representatives on the floor of this House. In the main, for more than a score of years, the Democratic Party here has been a party of obstruction—a party of theory. And the political tidal wave that brought the Democratic Party in the majority in this House was not so much of an expression of confidence in the Democratic Party as a rebuke to what the people thought was a dereliction of duty to them upon the part of the Republican Party, coupled with a lamentable division in its own ranks. The Democratic Party does not now have the confidence of a majority of the American people. The Democratic Party can win that confidence only by wise and constructive statesmanship. It can not win it by striking down an industry here and an industry there. It can not win it by legislating for one class of our people and against another class of our people. It can not win it by legislating for one section of our country and against another section of our country. It can not win it, and it does not deserve to win it, by legislation more favorable to other countries than our own. The championship of the people's rights should be confined by this House to the championship of the rights of Americans. Let foreign countries, except in extreme cases, look after their own. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the bill which we have before us we see the concrete result of 16 years of Democratic deliberation. I regret that I find myself unable to compliment the majority of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means on this their first essay in tariff legislation. The product of their deliberations is a bill which they themselves can not explain except in the vaguest terms. If there is one thing desirable in a tariff bill, and particularly in one like this, which affects millions of people and perhaps billions of money, it is clarity, and clarity is a feature of this bill that is conspicuous by its absence. It is utterly impossible for either friend or foe of this measure to more than guess at what it means. Its friends do not seem able to explain what they intend it to mean. Its opponents can form no idea of what it does mean. No one knows, or if he does he has not so far explained, either what industries this measure is intended to affect or what industries, as a matter of fact, it does affect.

We are told in the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee that it is hoped that it will not cause a loss of revenue of more than about \$10,500,000; but we can not be sure from anything that we have so far heard that it may not amount to millions upon millions more. In their zeal to show that, at least upon its face, this bill is intended to benefit one particular class of the community, its proponents have employed general terms. For instance, the word "agricultural" is used in so loose a way that it is impossible to tell how the provisions in which this word appears shall be construed. In reply to questions asked by some of us on this side who really want to know what we are voting for, we are asked to wait until the courts in the future shall have construed this measure.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my very good friend, and the one man on that side of the House particularly qualified to discuss any question of the tariff, was unable to cite me the other day the paragraph in the existing law to which an item on which I questioned him would apply. And later on, when I happened to hazard the remark that this paragraph might be difficult of construction by the Treasury officials, he replied, with a rather contemptuous reference to the high-priced Republican machinery which we had provided for the construction of tariff measures. I devoutly hope, Mr. Chairman, that this "high-priced Republican machinery" may never be called upon to construe this bill. But in the meantime it occurs to me that the membership of this House is entitled to know what we are voting upon now.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader upon this side of the House, in his speech the other day drilled this measure so full of holes that neither the polished suavity of my friend from New York [Mr. HARRISON] nor the brusque eloquence of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] can make any pretense of stopping them up.

There are such phrases as these:

All other agricultural implements of any kind or description.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask not to be interrupted now. I will be glad to yield further on to my colleague.

Also the following:

Other materials suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Wire for baling hay, straw, or other agricultural products.

Other kinds of wire suitable for fencing.

All prepared cereal foods.

They all occur in this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and others have asked what these phrases mean. Your answer has been, "They mean what they say." Now, that is no answer, gentlemen. It is no argument to say that we upon this side of the House are unduly technical, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] said the other day. The membership of this House is entitled to know what it is voting on. It does not know to-day, and it can not know under the language in this bill.

We have, at least, the right to know how much revenue we are voting away from the Government, and there is not a man upon this floor that can more than vaguely guess within millions. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation as to how this bill should be construed, in the absence of any amendment or amendments which would clarify its language, it is our duty as Members of this House to vote it down.

This House, intrusted as it is with the origination of tariff legislation, ought not to pass a bill such as this, no matter how unfavorable the ultimate prospect may be of its becoming a law.

In the time at my disposal I do not intend to discuss every feature of this bill, and only one in any great detail. I take up this feature not only because it affects millions of capital and thousands upon thousands of workmen, not only because it is a great industry in the district which I have the honor to represent, but because it is the best example I can imagine as illustrating the present and future policy of the Democratic Party with regard to the treatment of American industries. I mean the shoe and leather schedule.

If I approved of every other feature of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I should oppose it because it undertakes to put shoes and leather made from cattle hides on the free list. This proposition, it seems to me, strikes at the very foundation of the Republican theory of protection. If we are to vote this proposition into the law we might as well forever abandon the thought that we shall in the future give any consideration whatever to American industries or to American labor in making up tariff bills.

We are here asked to wipe out absolutely the meager duty that is still maintained upon leather and shoes, and which is placed there to equalize the difference between their cost of production here and abroad. Not the slightest attempt is made to show that there is no such difference in the cost of production, but we are simply told that if shoes and leather are placed on the free list it may possibly in the end reduce their price in the hands of the consumer.

The interests of the consumer are alone considered. The interests of the producer, both employer and employee, are thrown absolutely to the winds. If there were a high duty on shoes and leather; if it were claimed that there were inordinate profits made in their manufacture; if any one of you would even remotely suggest that there is a combination in the shoe and leather business there might be some excuse for bringing in this proposition at this time. But no such statement has been made. No such statement can be made. The duties on leather and

shoes are the lowest of those on the products of any great American industry in a highly manufactured state; in the one case but 5 per cent, in the other case but 10 per cent.

In the report of the majority of this committee the average duty on the paragraph in this bill is placed at but 7.38 per cent. Does anyone, even the most radical free trader, claim that a duty of 7.38 per cent is prohibitive, or even excessive? Can anyone claim that a duty so small as this adds perceptibly to the cost of an article in the hands of the ultimate consumer?

If there is one industry in which the keenest competition exists and always has existed in every part of this country, it is the shoe and leather industry. If there had been any chance of a combination in a portion of it—that is, the tanning industry—it was killed absolutely by the passage of the Payne law, which placed hides upon the free list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I voted for free hides, not in the interest of the shoe manufacturer nearly so much as in the interest of the independent tanner. The prospect seemed to be that if hides were not placed upon the free list, if the existing duty was maintained, the Chicago packers would go into the tanning business; and controlling as they would practically the entire American supply of hides, they would have had an advantage over their competitors of not less than 15 per cent, because their competitors would be thrown back upon the foreign market and have to pay a duty where the packers did not.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The placing of hides upon the free list has made free competition among all the tanners of this country, and they have now a duty of only 5 per cent as against all their competitors throughout the world.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will yield for a very brief question.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Did the gentleman take into consideration, when he voted to put hides upon the free list, the interests that the farmer and the stock grower had in the hide industry in this country?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, I believed at the time I voted to put hides on the free list that it would not reduce the price of cattle to any farmer, and the results seem to have proved that I was right, because the gentleman from Colorado may remember that immediately after the passage of the Payne law hides began to go up in price.

I have always accounted for that by the supposition that the independent tanners were so afraid that a duty would be maintained on hides and that they would be at a disadvantage of 15 per cent, as compared with their big Chicago competitors, that they were not buying in the hide market at all, and when hides were put on the free list all of them at once began to buy their raw material.

Now, in their wildest moments our opponents upon the other side of the aisle have never claimed that there was a combination of the shoe industry. The word "shoe" trust is perhaps the only trust that is absolutely absent from their vocabulary. There are more than 1,300 shoe factories in this country, and they are not confined, as some people seek to prove, to the territory of my friend from Massachusetts. In fact, New England altogether produces probably less than half of the shoes produced in this country. No one has ever claimed that the cloak of combination has been thrown over either few or many of them. On the contrary, their competition admittedly is fierce everywhere. In consideration of giving them their principal raw material—hides—free, Congress a few years ago reduced their protective duty 65 per cent, and it is to-day only 10 per cent. You propose now to wipe this absolutely out, still leaving the existing duties on the many other materials that are used in making shoes. Is this fair? Does this industry deserve the punishment you intend to inflict upon it? You say, "Yes; because some New England shoe manufacturers came before the Ways and Means Committee and said, 'Give us free hides and we will take free shoes.'" Now, my recollection of that incident is that there was just one man who ever made the statement in a public hearing that he was willing to have shoes go on the free list if hides were placed on the free list. But if it be true that anyone from New England advocated free shoes, it is not true, so far as I know, that anyone from any other part of the country did; and it is certainly not true as to any shoe or leather manufacturer in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I am not willing, if I can help it, that legislation should be passed which would wipe out these industries or, at the very least, cause a certain reduction in the wages of the labor employed therein. If you are for free trade in leather and shoes,

why not announce it as your policy with regard to all industries? Why do you single out this industry in particular, upon the flimsy excuse either that representatives of this industry ask for free trade, or that a duty of 7.38 per cent is a great burden upon the consumer?

But you say that the American manufacturer is not entitled to any protection at all, because under a duty of 25 per cent he was able to sell largely abroad and practically to control the American market. It is true that with modern machinery and modern methods American genius has been able, with a 25 per cent duty, to beat its competitors abroad in some classes of this trade, and this moderate duty has been sufficient to prevent the flooding of this market with foreign shoes of an inferior grade. But the situation to-day is very different. The shoe manufacturers in every country abroad have adopted our methods. They have installed our machinery in their factories. It will not be many months before practically every large factory abroad will enjoy every advantage, both in method and equipment, which has enabled the American manufacturer to compete with them in the past. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] cited the instance of the factory in Helsingfors, Finland, which is being equipped with precisely the same machinery as that in the largest factory in Haverhill, Mass. Already foreign competition is making itself very substantially felt in our market, and not only that, but our business in every country in Europe is rapidly falling off. It has ceased almost entirely in South America, where a very few years ago we had a large trade, and it has absolutely ceased in Australia, because Australia has just imposed a 30 per cent duty against us, three times our present duty against Australia.

I desire to insert at this point an article from the Boot and Shoe Trade Journal, of London. I will only read a sentence or two now, as it is somewhat long.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN SHOES.

Our readers will receive with some amazement the news that it is the intention of the W. L. Douglas Shoe Co., of Brockton, one of the largest direct shoe-distributing houses in America, to open stores in England. A few years ago we should have hesitated to use so strong a term of astonishment, but many changes have taken place since then and conditions have materially altered. Nevertheless, the pluck displayed by this concern in endeavoring to find a footing in England in the face of the now existing circumstances is worthy of all praise. To the manufacturers of America we owe much, and to those who have opened retail stores here we owe perhaps a little. To the shoe manufacturers of the United States belongs the credit of waking up the shoe manufacturers of England, and we grant it to them in no ungrudging spirit, because we are not only thankful that they came and woke us up, but the awakening has been to the shoe trade of this country a veritable godsend, for we are now fully able to meet their competition at home and, furthermore, carry it with undoubted success into the very heart of America itself. The Douglas Shoe Co., therefore, comes to us under vastly different and vastly more difficult conditions than those firms who established their stores here when the demand for American shoes was at its height and when the makers of American shoes could lay claim to features in their productions which were not to be found in goods of British manufacture. To-day the facts are otherwise. There is no good point in an American shoe that can not be found in British goods of equal value, and there is in addition much that is not to be found in the rival production. If the belief therefore exists that our American friends will again forge ahead and leave us behind, and that the belief is inspiring the new venture and furnishing food for consolation amongst the proprietors of the American stores established here, then the sooner the delusion dies the better. This might not be the case if we were not meeting Brother Jonathan in an open field, if we had not his competition to meet at home and on the Continent, and if we had not to meet the competition of the continental manufacturers, who are waking up to new methods as ours have done. Although the consumption of American shoes is declining in this country and on the Continent, we have no doubt that very considerable quantities will continue to be sold here and there, but such goods will undoubtedly be distributed mainly through the medium of American-owned stores. The more stores of this kind there are the less there will be for each. Few retailers stock the American article, and those who do are carrying it in diminished quantities each year. Looking at the figures just to hand for the last seven months of 1910, we find that America sent us only \$799,453 worth of shoes as against \$988,762 worth during the same period of 1909. Her shipments to France fell in like manner from \$229,028 to \$165,814, and to Germany from \$371,266 to \$300,718. On the other hand, the shipment of English shoes to the continent went on increasing, and indications point to a further increase in the number and extent of the transaction. Let us take the case of Belgium as an example of the influence of the British boot on the Continent. France and Germany are her nearest neighbors, yet England supplies the greatest part of her imported footwear. The following are the principal figures: Great Britain, value of sales last year, £67,400; France, £25,750; Germany, £20,600; Austria, £4,300; United States, £9,000. The reason is not hard to find. We are selling shoes to America, and the world knows it pretty well by now. The continental buyers of foreign shoes know it, too, and doubtless reason with themselves in this way: That if England is selling shoes to America it is because they are better and that it is policy for them to buy English shoes instead. In this way the continental trade in foreign shoes is drifting from America to England. It is, of course, a matter of much gratification to us not only because it brings extra grist to the Britisher's mill, but because this journal was instrumental in getting British shoes onto the American market. It is gratifying to us to know that our pioneering work has been successfully followed up and that a steadily growing trade is being built up in the United States and Canada. This week the representatives of six British firms start out to lay their samples before the buyers of the above-mentioned countries, and in our minds we have no doubt that the results will be pleasant to the firms in question. The interest displayed by both American and Canadian buyers

in British goods is a happy omen. We say this because the American citizen is the most patriotic of all men. He does not change his boot-maker for sentiment; he changes for something better; and, despite every attempt on the part of our ultrapatriotic contemporaries in the States to belittle the merits of English-made footwear, our goods are forging a way for themselves out there, and it is now more readily granted that British boots are best, that they are all we claim for them, and that, money for money, they are, owing to our national economic conditions and cheaper methods of production, of exceedingly better value. (From the Boot and Shoe Trades Journal, London, England.)

I call the English shoe manufacturers themselves to witness that they can produce shoes of the same quality cheaper in England to-day than we can and undersell us in our home market. And yet your proposition is to put boots and shoes, under these conditions, on the free list.

Why can they produce shoes cheaper in England than they can here? This brings me to the very foundation of the question before us. Have the English shoe manufacturers any advantage by way of machinery over us? Not at all, because they have our machinery, or at least machinery manufactured on the same lines, in accordance with their patent laws.

Have they any advantage of method over us? Not at all, because they have adopted our methods. What advantage, then, have they? Simply and solely a lower wage scale. The wages in England are somewhere about one-half—possibly a little more, but in most cases about one-half—what they are in this country.

Now, if it be true that England can produce cheaper than we can, then it is all the more true that other European countries can produce cheaper even than that, because there their wages are lower than England's wages. They are anywhere from two to four times lower than they are in this country. Here, Mr. Chairman, we have an industry competing not only for the foreign, but to-day even for our home market, with every European nation, an industry in which we have no advantage whatever over any one of our foreign competitors and but one marked disadvantage, to wit, the high wage cost here. Here we have the Republican policy of protection reduced to bed-rock. We do not have to argue in this case about insuring profit to the manufacturer.

The question here at issue is insuring reasonable wages to American workmen; and that is all there is to it. In your zeal for cheapening cost you propose to do it by reducing wages. You can not get away from it by any high-flown rhetoric or appeal to the farmer or anybody else. Your proposition is to make shoes cheaper by paying less wages to the man that makes them. You propose to reduce his purchasing power to the level of that of the worst paid laborer in any foreign factory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How about the shoe workers themselves? Do you think they are going to receive this proposition with equanimity? I call your attention to a letter printed in the RECORD of April 24, on page 566. I will only read one sentence of it. This letter is written by Mr. John F. Tobin, general president of the National Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, protesting against the passage of this measure:

The greater efficiency of labor in the shoe industry in the United States as against any foreign country is not sufficient to offset the lower standards of living in all foreign countries as compared with the United States, notwithstanding cheaper labor prices which prevail in foreign countries. To put shoes and finished leather on the free list, or in any way to reduce the present tariff, would compel the American shoe manufacturers to meet foreign competition through the only avenue open to them, namely, to attack the wages of the shoe workers and thereby bring about a standard of wages lower than at present, and which would result in an industrial warfare, and no doubt eventually would lower the standard of wages and constantly lower the standard of living.

There you have the whole question in a nutshell. It has been one of your stock arguments that although wages were higher here than they were abroad, the increased efficiency of the American workmen more than make up to the manufacturer for the difference in wages. If that is true anywhere it is not true here. Admitting that the American shoe worker may be more intelligent than his competitor abroad, his equipment and his means of production are no better. They are on exactly the same basis. Therefore, what Mr. Tobin says is perfectly true, that if you put shoes on the free list, the only recourse the American manufacturer can take if he desires to retain the American market will be to reduce wages.

My friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] the other day made a witty and eloquent if not a thoroughly convincing speech upon this bill. He devoted much time to the discussion of the free list, and apparently enjoyed himself hugely in enumerating many of the articles that are contained therein. He reveled in the pronouncement of such items as broken bells, dried blood, fossils, and junk. He displayed some familiarity with the humors of this paragraph. He was funny, but he might have been funnier. He spoke of "catgut" and "whip

gut," but he forgot their ancient companion, "worm gut." He mentioned "junk," but he forgot its romantic colleague, "punk." He spoke of "fossils," but he forgot "bones." He spoke of "dried blood," but he forgot "pula" and "divi-divi." He mentioned "leeches," but he forgot "unmanufactured lava." He displayed an almost inexcusable unfamiliarity with some of the more abstruse features of the free list—and I call this particularly to the attention of my friend from New York [Mr. HARRISON], because he is an authority upon the chemical schedule and all the products of chemicals—by neglecting to mention, for instance, "amidonaphtolsulfoacids," "binitrochlorbenzol," "diamidostilbensulfoacid," "dimethylanilin," and other chemicals of the kind which will readily occur to any close student of the free list.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. He did not forget them. He only forgot how to pronounce them; that is all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. His failure to enumerate "beeswax," "burgundy pitch," "cudbear," "cuttlefish," "dragon's blood," "uncleaned horsehair," "jalap," "munjeet," "manna," "myrobolans," "nux vomica," "salep," sometimes called "salop," "skeletons," "turmeric," "witherite," and last, but not least, "zaffer," was to my mind reprehensible, if not inexcusable, in a member of the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee, who was essaying to enlighten this House and the country upon the tariff in general and the Republican free list in particular.

Now, these and many other things upon the free list are funny, and they are always brought in to illuminate the sometimes turgid speeches of Democratic orators upon the tariff question. Why are they funny? Simply and solely because they are not produced in this country. They are unfamiliar to the average man. No American capital is invested in producing them. No American labor is employed in producing them. If American capital and American labor made these things, there would be nothing funny about them. There is no more inherent humor in the word "zaffer" than there is in the word "wool." There is nothing funnier about the word "munjeet" than about the word "shoes." There is nothing more inherently comic about the word "spunk" than there is about the word "leather." And yet the pronouncement of "wool," "leather," and "shoes" does not make people laugh. It is for the reason that shoes and leather and wool are great American industries, and conducted in sharp competition with other nations of the world, that they are not upon any Republican free list, and I hope never will be on any free list.

Our policy is to put noncompetitive articles on the free list, articles which can not be produced here at all. It develops that it is the policy of our opponents to put competitive articles upon the free list, articles which can be and are produced at home. Under our present law about half of everything imported into this country comes in free of duty, and that is because we are unwilling to risk the increasing of the cost of any article to the consumer unless some American industry can be established and maintained and some American workmen given employment. The logical result of the theory of gentlemen upon the other side of a tariff for revenue is that a duty should be placed upon every article which can not be produced in this country, because what can not be produced here must be imported, and must produce revenue if you put a duty upon it. That policy, carried to its logical conclusion, would burden every American consumer without benefiting a single American producer.

We are opposed to a policy which would burden any American unless we are certain thereby to benefit some other American.

Your free list would not be so humorous as ours. You would cut out some of the humor by transferring it to the dutiable list and add to its seriousness by a transfer of serious subjects from the dutiable list. In your desire to make the free list less comic you will undoubtedly succeed if you are elevated to power in the Nation. When you have transferred to it articles well known in the everyday vocabulary of the American people; when you have placed the American producer on an exact level with the foreign producer; when you have placed American labor on an exact equality with the ill-paid labor of the rest of the world, there will be mighty little left to laugh at on the free list. And that is the result of the Democratic policy of a tariff for revenue! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Upon this side of the House we have recently differed slightly as to the true conception of the doctrine of protection. Some of us have evidenced by our votes on the Canadian reciprocity bill that we do not believe that a duty upon any competing article should be abolished or substantially lowered, even in favor of some one country, and whether we get corresponding advantages in the way of lower duties from that country or not. There are others of us, of whom I was one, who evidenced the belief that the ordinary rule does not apply in the case of a

reciprocal arrangement with one other country only, one similarly situated and where industrial conditions are substantially the same, and where, by a mutual policy of give-and-take, whatever possible detriment we may suffer in one direction would seem to be compensated for by corresponding advantages in others. To my mind the difference between a duty fixed by Congress to carry out the terms of a reciprocal agreement negotiated with another country and a similar duty fixed in the general tariff is the difference between black and white. To me the distinction between a free list of competitive articles in a reciprocal agreement and in a general tariff is as clear as day is from night.

If the reciprocity bill which lately passed the House had contained free flour and free meat, I should have been glad to vote for it. I wish it had. I am perfectly willing to give Canada free flour and free meat if she will return the compliment, but I am not willing to put meat and flour on the free list as against every other country in the world whether they make any corresponding reduction to us or not; nor am I willing to give free shoes to Australia when Australia still retains a duty of 30 per cent against us. I am in favor of reciprocity in some cases in competitive articles, but I am opposed to free trade with the world in competitive articles.

But I do not intend to discuss in detail the question of reciprocity now. It is probable that the distinction which seems clear to me is a distinction which may seem to be without a difference to some of my colleagues. But upon the proposition that we are to place on the free list, as applied to every nation in the world, articles which cost more to produce in this country than abroad, and in the production of which American capital is invested and American labor employed, I believe there is no difference among us. We stand together upon the tariff plank in the last Republican platform. We insist that upon every article which we produce in competition with every nation in the world that the duty shall be maintained at least equal to the difference in the cost of production here and there. In this bill you have in one article, at least, an example of the working of this theory of protection in its simplest form. You are asking us to put upon the free list an article which it is proved costs more to produce here than it costs to produce in any country in Europe, by an amount at least equal to the difference in the labor cost there and here. In your alleged zeal in the interest of the consumer you ignore absolutely the interest of the American producer, both employer and employee; you consider only the interest of his foreign competitor. If there were nothing else in your bill that is objectionable, this alone ought to condemn it in the eyes of any man who believes in the Republican theory of protection. Upon such a proposition as this I believe that we upon this side can unite, and if we do, regardless of what may be the ultimate fate of this bill, we shall have done our duty to American industries and to American labor. We shall have been true to the principles and traditions of the Republican Party. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he sits down?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; I will first yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX of Ohio. It is the contention of my colleague that the part of the bill which relates to boots and shoes will be harmful to the shoe industry in Ohio, is it not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true that the largest manufacturer of boots and shoes in Ohio besieged this body two years ago with a request to take the duty off boots and shoes because it was unnecessary?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. COX of Ohio. You do not know whether the Wolf Bros., of Columbus, asked this House to take the duty off boots and shoes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Every Member of this House received a letter.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not.

Mr. COX of Ohio. It is the contention of the gentleman from Ohio that two years ago, if I am correct, boots and shoes might have been placed on the free list, but that since then the foreign manufacturers have adopted modern American machinery. Is that correct?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It would have been safer then than now.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Then, the duty two years ago should not have been put on boots and shoes, because our methods of making them were much more modern than foreign methods?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not discussing now whether a duty of 25 per cent on shoes in consideration of the fact that there was a duty of 15 per cent on hides was the absolutely correct duty or not. I am simply discussing the question as to whether the removal of a duty of 10 per cent would not absolutely destroy the boot and shoe industry. It may be possible that some gentleman in Ohio begged my friend and other Members of Congress to put hides upon the free list, saying, in an excess of enthusiasm, that if hides were placed on the free list the large manufacturer could stand free shoes. That was the statement made by one individual before the Ways and Means Committee. I do not know whether it was correct or not. I do know that the gentleman who made it, and who was representing at that time some of the New England shoe manufacturers, within a very few days came back and withdrew the statement absolutely.

Mr. COX of Ohio. The promise was made to the Ways and Means Committee that if hides were placed on the free list that boots and shoes would be placed on the free list?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No such promise was ever made.

Mr. COX of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, he speaks of the humor of the situation. I think, in our State particularly, if he obtrudes the observation that two years ago shoes could have been placed on the free list, but now they can not, inasmuch as the foreign manufacturer has recently adopted American machinery, he will be contributing considerably to the humor of the situation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman now, I think, is contributing somewhat to the humor of the situation. I said that the humor of the situation consisted in the enumeration by Democratic orators of funny things they found on the Republican free list. Would the gentleman like to have wool on the free list? Would he see any humor in that?

Mr. COX of Ohio. No. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will say frankly that I am not for free wool at this time, favoring a cut of about 50 per cent in the whole woolen schedule. But I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Two years ago he dilated considerably upon the virtues of the maximum and minimum provision. It is significant that you do not refer to it to-day. Why? Has it not worked out well?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has worked out beautifully.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true that the maximum is not in operation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has worked out so well that there is not a country in the world that does not give us as good treatment as it gives to any other country, and there is no occasion for enforcing the maximum.

Mr. COX of Ohio. As a matter of truth, Germany, whose tariff relations with us are not as desirable as with other countries, has been given the minimum provisions, and the gentleman himself knows that the beginning of the Canadian reciprocity movement was inspired by the fact that the maximum and minimum provision had proven an absolute failure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary, it has been an eminent success.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

Mr. HELGESEN. In speaking of the position taken by the Republicans in their last national platform you said that we stood for a duty that should equal the difference in the cost of production abroad and at home; is it not also true that they said plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is quite true, and I said that here was a case where we do not have to haggle about that. It has come down to the absolute labor cost. It is the difference in the wages paid to shoemakers abroad and the shoemakers at home.

Mr. HELGESEN. Was that element taken into consideration when the Canadian reciprocity question was discussed?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have just said that I believe in this distinction—not admitted by some other gentlemen, whose opinion may be worth a good deal more than mine—that there is a substantial difference between placing an article on the free list or reducing it substantially in an agreement with another country, where that country makes the corresponding reduction, and doing the same thing in the general tariff.

Mr. HELGESEN. In all the discussions that have been heard on the floor of this House during the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity question there has not been one man who suggested that under the new arrangement the farmers could make a reasonable profit, and therefore I would like to know whether the gentleman and others who voted for that agreement believed that in the question of guaranteeing profits the manufacturers were the only ones to be considered and not the farmers?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, I will say that that question did not occur to my mind in my vote on reciprocity.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman, in reference to the distinction he makes between reciprocity legislation and tariff agreements, whether he would be willing to have free trade with the entire world provided it should be secured through reciprocal agreements?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman tell us the particulars of the distinction in that case?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was speaking simply of this particular reciprocal agreement negotiated by the duly authorized representatives of this country with the authorized representatives of Canada. I do not regard it as a blow aimed at the policy of protection as enunciated in the last Republican platform, even if, perchance, there may be some duty which by that arrangement might be lowered below the competitive point. I hope that in this case there is not. I doubt whether there are many such instances, if any, in the Canadian reciprocity agreement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Following the gentleman's viewpoint on the question of protection and reciprocity, is it his idea that there is no advantage to this country in the lowering of duties on goods from Canada other than that which comes from having the Canadians lower their duties to us?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no. That is one element in it, but there are a great many other elements.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us follow that a moment. The gentleman admits that an advantage is obtained from the lowering of the duties, aside from what Canada gives us in the way of a wider market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, certainly. For instance, Canada at present has a duty of 3 cents a pound on meat. We have a duty of 1½ cents a pound on meat. We are therefore at a marked disadvantage in trading with Canada, with her duty 100 per cent higher than ours. Canada, in consideration of our reducing our duty, reduces hers. I wish they had gone the whole length; I wish they had put meat on the free list.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, we only get an advantage by reason of having the Canadian market made easier of access to us by the lowering of the duties?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is an advantage.

Mr. SHERLEY. And we may or may not get an advantage, from the gentleman's viewpoint, from the lowering of our duties? I would like to ask the gentleman what his idea is as to the effect of our lowering our duties on Canadian products, without regard to the advantage we get in the Canadian market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I doubt if there is any substantial advantage to us.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, then, the gentleman's justification for the reciprocity treaty is simply the opening up to us of the Canadian market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is a large element.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, that is not the only one?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The proposition in the Canadian reciprocity treaty, which I believe is going to insure to us ultimately the benefit of the pulp wood of Canada, by the removal of the restrictions which now prevail in some of her Provinces, is worth an immense amount.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, the gentleman thinks we can have an advantage by getting imported into this country cheaper something from a foreign country?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not say we would get anything from Canada cheaper.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, the gentleman says the great justification of the treaty is the pulp-wood provision.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I said that this is a case of a treaty between two countries which are substantially similarly situated, where the people are of the same kind and where the industrial conditions are substantially the same.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let me put a concrete case to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say this to the gentleman, that I would not be willing to give Canada free entry into our market on anything of which the cost of production was greater in this country than there under any circumstances, unless she would give us a corresponding advantage. That is as far as I am going. I submit that that does not apply in this case, because here the question is of a free list open to the entire world, with no possible reciprocity.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I understand the gentleman aright, then there is no circumstance in the home market that would warrant, in his judgment, the taking off of a duty on any article

brought in from another country unless the other country gave us a similar concession?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not where there is a substantial difference in the cost of production in those articles here and abroad.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not even where the market was absolutely controlled by the home producer and there was a false price exacted?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If it developed that there was no difference in the cost of production here and abroad, I might be willing to put such article on the free list.

Mr. SHERLEY. But suppose there was a difference, and the home market was being absolutely monopolized at a false price?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am opposed to any duty which would offer an opportunity for a monopoly. I would be glad to vote to reduce that duty; and wherever it is shown to me, so long as I am in Congress, that the duty in this country is so much higher on any article than the actual difference between the cost of production of that article here and abroad that it offers opportunity to make monopoly prices I will vote to reduce it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why is not the burden on the gentleman to show that the duty is needed?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The burden on the gentleman, in voting for a bill like this, is to vote according to the platform on which he was elected.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a very easy way, and I congratulate the gentleman upon finding such an easy method.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is a very pleasant method, and I enjoy it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will permit. Is the pulp-wood feature in connection with the reciprocity bill any different now, so far as Canada is concerned, than it was before?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, decidedly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We have made a reduction, but Canada did not have any tariff on it any more than she has now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that that involves quite a long discussion, showing what may be involved in the removal of the restrictions of the two Provinces which now impose an export duty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was the same way with lumber. Canada has made no reduction in lumber. It is exactly as it was before, but the United States did give Canada the advantage of lowering her duties, to pay Canada for putting her agricultural products into the United States, to put down the price of the product of the American farmer.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. About one minute more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, I will yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY].

Mr. ANSBERRY. Did I understand my colleague to say that the reason he was in favor of protection on shoes was due to the fact that American machinery was now being used in Europe for the manufacture of shoes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. For that and other reasons. The other reasons are that our home market is in danger, our foreign market is being taken away from us, and that our exports are falling off every day.

Mr. ANSBERRY. I do not understand that protection will give us the foreign market.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is simply an illustration of the fact that the duty to-day is as low as that industry can possibly stand, and I am not willing to put it lower.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Yes; but I understand the gentleman to take the position he does for the reason that he wants protection against American machinery in Europe, and not against foreign pauper labor, which has been the excuse heretofore.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not talking about American machinery in Europe. I am simply stating the changed conditions of manufacture over there. Their method of production and their equipment are now as good as ours, and the great advantage they have over us is the reduced cost of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.

For the benefit of the membership I wish to inform them that this passage is from the Scripture, and they will find it in the fifth chapter of James and the sixteenth verse. [Laughter.]

I congratulate you—the Ways and Means Committee—for the forthcoming of this bill. It is familiarly known as the farmers' free-list bill. It is a confession that the measure recently passed by the House and denominated "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," was an inconsiderate blow at the food-producing toilers of our land, and as merciless as their poor and needy condition was undeserving. [Applause.] I hope and trust with you that by the passage of this bill you will heal the wounds you have received and avoid the others these producers had in store for you because of the passage of the other bill. This bill may well be denominated in legal parlance "A bill of confession and avoidance." The bill you passed, called "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," viewed from the standpoint of these toiling sons is a misnomer. They believe in contractual parlance it should bear another cognomen, namely, "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations between the people of Canada, parties of the first part, and the metropolitan newspapers and the trust manufacturers of the United States, parties of the second part." [Applause.] Again, reduced to legal parlance, the bill might be more comprehensive should it read, "The metropolitan press, the trust manufacturers of the United States, and the Dominion of Canada on the relation of the President, petitioners, against the farmers and stock growers of the United States, respondents." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hope that some good friend, either upon the Republican side or upon our side, and I am thankful their name is legion, will remind me before I am through to give my views about what is meant in the bill by the "and for other purposes." Before I go any further, however, allow me to advert to what may be regarded as a matter personal to myself. You know I opposed the reciprocity agreement, and it has been intimated by some one—and doubtless, so far as I know, has been well circulated in this body on our side of the Chamber—that under the caucus rule I could not absolve myself and therefore was not at liberty to vote against the agreement. Upon that I wish to say I was before the campaign, and have been ever since, connected with three great organizations, namely, the Grangers, the Farmers' Union, and the Stock Growers' Association; that at their picnics, county fairs, and all my meetings during the campaign, when honored by members of any of them as auditors, I pointed out the very condition of things which might occur and which has occurred by the presence of that bill in Congress. I took as my text the report of the Massachusetts commission on the high cost of living, which report is found in Senate Document No. 523, Sixty-first Congress, second session, presented by Senator Lodge, and I quote therefrom as follows:

On the other hand, however, it is clear that in a period of rising prices like the present the tariff cuts off possible relief to consumers by closing access to the cheapest sources of food supply in the world's markets. In the past, the duties on the necessities of common consumption, foodstuffs, have been largely inoperative, because the country produced not only its own food supply, but a large surplus for exportation.

The United States appears, however, to be approaching rapidly the turning point when it will become instead of a food-exporting a food-importing country.

Under these conditions, as the duties on foodstuffs become actually operative, their effect must be to increase the cost of living to wage earners and the expenses of production to manufacturers, thus hampering the development of industry and defeating the very purpose of the protective policy.

The commission is therefore of the opinion that when the tariff shall further be revised, the expediency of removing all duties on food products be considered carefully by the National Congress, and it hopes that the Tariff Commission will be equipped with such funds and powers as may be necessary for researches adequate as a basis for future changes, to be founded on a commercial rather than political consideration.

I pledged them that when the time came that the farmers' product was asked to be put upon the free list I would resist to my utmost such action, until all of the articles of consumption purchased by the farmers were simultaneously free listed. [Applause.]

The rule of the caucus I invoked for the purpose of absolving me from being bound by its action is as follows:

7. In deciding upon action in the House involving party policy or principle a two-thirds vote of those present and voting at a caucus meeting shall bind all members of the caucus: *Provided*, The said two-thirds vote is a majority of the full Democratic membership of the House: *And provided further*, That no Member shall be bound upon questions involving a construction of the Constitution of the United States or upon which he made contrary pledges to his constituents prior to his election or received contrary instructions by resolutions or platform from his nominating authority.

8. Whenever any member of the caucus shall determine, by reason of either of the exceptions provided for in the above paragraph, not to be bound by the action of the caucus on those questions, it shall be his duty, if present, so to advise the caucus before the adjournment of the

meeting, or if not present at the meeting, to promptly notify the Democratic leader in writing, so that the party may be advised before the matter comes to issue upon the floor of the House.

I complied with the rule. I said to my constituents that the Republican Party had maintained its imperial power by imposing on the credulity of the farmers and stock raisers; that to obtain their votes, and for that reason alone, the party had for years kept on the statute books laws placing high duties on all the flocks of the pasture, the yield of the fields, the products of the garden, and the fruits of the orchards; that for all those years practically everything they consumed was also by these same laws protected by high duties; that the difference, however, was that the laws in the one case were inoperative and useless to them, in the other actively operative against them. The duties on the things he produced came not into competition with those of any other country, and therefore these duties were mere "make believes," or, in other words, "fakes," and deliberately calculated to deceive. [Applause.]

I recalled to them that the Republican Party had always attributed their improvement to these duties on their products; that they well remembered improvement in their condition was never omitted to be mentioned by the advocates of high protection; that if one thing above all others was indelibly traced upon their memories it was that one word "improvement."

I told them that, reading between the lines, I could see from the tenor of the report of this Massachusetts commission that if the Republican Party should be returned to power a knock would soon be heard at the doors of Congress, demanding that now, since those old fake laws were about to become operative and the farmers and stock growers might receive a benefit, the time had arrived for their repeal. And I begged of them, if they would avoid such a calamity, to dethrone the party of false pretenses and bring back to power the grand old Democratic Party—their tried and true friend. I told them that in the revision of the tariff its first main effort would be to lift the yoke from their bowed necks and unburden their stooped shoulders from excessive taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in the main I am for the present bill. It has the merit of a good name. Without its passage, however, I am afraid the farmers would liken it and the reciprocity bill to an incident occurring in one of the villages in my district where lived an old German and his wife. She was taken ill and sent to a hospital. Hans, as he passed from day to day to and fro from his work, would ask the attendant, "How is mine vife to-day?" The attendant would answer, "Improving." This went on for many days, and the last time he asked "Vell, how is mine vife to-day?" the attendant answered: "We discharged the old doctor, and before the new one could quite understand the case she suddenly passed away." Hans, rushing off to the first saloon to assuage his grief, said to the barkeeper: "Mine Gott in himmel, gif me von glass of beer; mine poor vife, she pass away." "Why," said the barkeeper, "Hans, this is very sudden." "Yah," answered Hans, "sudden vass vot de new doctor dit, but she had von bad disease unter the old doctor." "Why, Hans, what was that?" asked the barkeeper. Hans answered, "Vy, dot disease vot dey calls 'improvements.'" [Laughter and applause.]

As I am in duty bound as a good Democrat, I propose to go back to my old farmer friends and tell them that they were right in discharging the old doctor; that the improvement of their condition claimed by the Republican Party was in a truthful sense but an imperfect canterization of a cancerous growth; that the disease was complex as well as chronic; and, therefore, no wonder the new doctor got confused in his diagnosis and gave the patient at first the wrong dose, but it had no sooner been given than he saw the black shadow approaching and immediately administered the antidote, and, now, thanks to a wise Providence, the patient is in reality improving. [Applause.]

I am happy to hear back these glad tidings, but if they say to me, "The reciprocity bill passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President, but the farmers' free-list bill did not pass the Senate," I shall say to them that the Democrats on this floor who voted to send the two measures to the Senate separately—all of them, with the possible exception of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], whom I believe gave the excuse that he was not under oath, or something of the kind—swore they believed both measures would pass the Senate and be signed by the President. I do not want to be compelled to tell them—and I am assured by my friends on this side that I will not—after their long wait upon sore feet without a shade from the broiling sun, begrimed with soil of the farm, or upon frozen ground with gloveless fingers benumbed, and frost-bitten feet, shod in worn-out but costly brogans, shivering in their

shoddy and threadbare common clothes, unsheltered by any friendly windbreak from the cold blasts—no; I do not want to tell them that the cars on this route do not carry a trailer; that the only car is loaded with the well-to-do city folks, and they must walk. No; I must tell them that the trailer is surely attached and it is especially reserved for them; that the conductor has been directed under penalty of instant discharge to collect only the usual fare, and not to side switch the trailer. [Applause.]

No, my fellow Democrats, do not have any misgivings but what I will make doubly plain to them that you are sincere and that if anything happens to these measures, either at the other end of the Capitol or at the other end of the Avenue, it will not be chargeable to any intentional blunder on your part.

It is proven beyond cavil that, considering the high prices of things the farmer consumes, the increase of wages, and so forth, he is not making a profit beyond his due. Even the Massachusetts commission, the Senate committee, and the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as the arguments in the debates on the subject in these Halls, concede that fact and with one accord they all agree that the middleman gets the profit; that such profit measures the increase of cost to the consumer.

The following food bill of New York City for last year tells this story:

	Received by farmer.	Paid by consumer.
Onions.....	\$821,000	\$8,212,000
Potatoes.....	8,437,000	60,000,000
Coffee.....	2,402,000	12,009,000
Rice.....	1,354,000	6,191,000
Cabbages.....	1,825,000	9,125,000
Milk.....	22,912,000	48,880,000
Eggs.....	17,238,000	28,730,000
Meat and poultry.....	219,300,000	291,000,000
	274,289,000	464,147,000

From the foregoing table it will be observed that of the products enumerated the middle man received of the sum expended for onions, ten-elevenths; of potatoes, seven-eighths; of coffee, nearly five-sixths; of rice, more than four-fifths; of cabbages, five-sixths; of milk, more than two-thirds; of eggs, more than three-fifths; and of that expended for meat and poultry, more than one-half.

Therefore, why reduce the farmers' price? If he is not getting more than his just allowance, why not strike at the middle man and make him yield a part of his profits? [Applause.]

But some of these economists tell us that to tear down the wall between Canada and this country and allow their farm products to come into competition with the products of our farmers can not hurt the latter, because, forsooth, that country is bleak and cold and its soil of short-lived productiveness. Why then tear down the wall at all? If the farmer is not to be injured and the consumer is not to be benefited, does it not appear an unnecessary performance? Economists of another school tell us that our farmers are a shiftless lot—they do not work hard enough, their methods of farming are antiquated, they ought to produce more, and if they would only rise a little earlier in the morning and work a little later at night, perspire a little more, and so forth, they could produce enough to fully satisfy the middle man and cheaper food would pass on to the consumer. Others tell us the farmer is rolling in wealth and is spending his time in idle luxury. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] emphasizes this idea by his good-natured sarcasm when he referred to the old farmer cheerily sitting before his blazing fire, produced by corn fuel, smoking his cob pipe, and his sons rejoicing they did not have to chop wood. [Laughter.]

When the gentleman from Massachusetts was thus demonstrating his utter ignorance of the present-day condition of the farmer, I not only recalled that it was also but a piece of the same cloth of indifference shown by the Massachusetts commission, to which I have referred, but I was also reminded of a boy I once knew whose father lived on the opposite side of the creek from where I did. His father was taken very ill, and being solicitous concerning his condition, I often hallooed across asking the boy how his father was. After his illness had lasted quite a while, on making another inquiry of the boy one morning, he answered, "Oh, dad's dead, but I've got his jackknife!" [Laughter and applause.]

I will not diverge further to express my disapproval of the sentiment of derision at the expense of the farmer, revealed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], than to ob-

serve that he and his colleague Mr. PETERS appear in entire accord in their sympathy with the manufacturers of their State, and are equally oblivious to the heavy burden the farmers have carried and are still carrying, and view with equanimity the revenues derived by their constituents at the expense of the farmers through the high protective duties under the present tariff system. [Applause.] It will serve no purpose to refer further to the many other scholars of the other economic schools whose equally divergent views are spread on the Record. Suffice it to say that, in my judgment, the reader of these pages in years to come will cease to regard the degree of confusion that fell upon the tongues of the plainmen of Shi-nar as at all marvelous. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, denuded of veneer, subterfuge, sophistry, and demagoguery, what are the simple facts, and how are the interests of that third of our population constituting the staff of the Nation to be affected by the reciprocity measure?

The Dominion of Canada occupies a space to our north extending from one ocean to the other, a distance of 3,200 miles. The five great western Provinces have a domain equal to that of the combined States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado. The prairie Provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, equal the domain of England, France, Germany, and Italy combined, and therein are over 200,000,000 acres of land upon which a furrow has not yet been made, capable of growing wheat of a production of 3,000,000,000 bushels annually—five times as much as we produced last year. Besides that, these Provinces have an acreage of over 250,000,000 of the best grazing land now known. It is only within the last 10 years that any considerable attention has been given to the development of the section, yet the production of wheat from the whole area last year was approximately one-third of our own. A false impression has gone abroad to the effect that in the three great Canadian Provinces the cold is so intense that production of crops and stock raising is impossible. Yet the facts are that stock are turned out on the range in early March and are not rounded up until October, and fall plowing is carried on up to the last of November.

I know it must appear strange to this membership that I am so dense upon such questions as the cost of the manufacture of eyelets and shoestrings, that enormous product of the State of Massachusetts [laughter], but they should not start in amazement when I tell them the rigors of the late spring and fall months, even in Colorado—a place of perennial sunshine and a mile or more nearer Heaven—forbids the growing of crops and the raising of stock as economically as appears to be done in Canada.

Those who prophesy that these Western Provinces will never be settled up and their products come in competition with the American producer should take warning if they would only remember that such statesmen as Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, opposed the Louisiana purchase on the ground that it was only inhabited by blanket Indians and half-breeds and never would be settled by white men, and threatened secession on the part of Massachusetts if the purchase was consummated. He, by the way, was the original secessionist of this country, and when called to order by the presiding officer was compelled to retract the threat. The same may be said to have been the opinion of another great statesman from that Commonwealth, Daniel Webster, who entertained the same views. Even that great statesman of a much later period, Horace Greeley, enjoyed the same opinion respecting that portion of the purchase lying west of the Mississippi River. After his visit to Colorado in the sixties, he advised the readers of his paper not to go west in search of the precious minerals, and yet the sod had hardly grown firm upon his grave—at least, his great personality and ability as a journalist and statesman was still fresh and green in memory—when the State of Colorado alone up to 1908 contributed to the wealth of the world in precious minerals the grand total of \$1,052,303,180.36; and from that time forward has maintained its average contribution. [Applause.]

You all remember that side-splitting speech of Proctor Knott, of Kentucky, delivered in this House 40 years ago last February, known as the Duluth speech. When a measure was before Congress for the granting of certain lands to build a railroad whose terminus would be Duluth, such a place could not be found on the map. He opposed the bill, not so much because it was paternalistic, but because no one, as he said, would ever ride on a railroad to such a far-off, unknown, and uninhabitable country, and that we were not in special need in this country of pine bushes, the only product, he asserted, that could be found there for a back haul. [Laughter.]

And yet we behold, contrary to these early as well as these modern prophets, that within the borders of the Louisiana

Purchase is contained practically one-third of the population of the United States; that the little village of Duluth, which was not on the map 40 years ago, has added to its population 2,000 every year since Proctor Knott made that speech, and the population of that shrunken State in which it is located has increased until it is now close to seventh in rank among the States of the Union and produces one-eighth of the wheat crop. Its metropolis, Minneapolis, has increased from 13,066 in 1870 to 301,408 in 1910, and its capital, St. Paul, has grown from a population of 20,030 in 1870 to 214,744, as shown by the recent census report.

Further than that, they should remember that in 1790 our population was under 4,000,000 and the population of Canada was 180,000. Basing our population at 90,000,000 to-day and that of Canada at 8,000,000, the advance of Canada's population is nearly double ours, and based on the increase of latter years the population of Canada in the next generation will equal the number we have to-day.

These lands in Canada, according to statistics, yield more than 5 bushels per acre more than the average of ours; their farm lands are selling from one-third to one-half less than ours; normal wages are from 25 to 30 per cent less than ours; that country enjoys the benefit of the preferential duty with the mother country to our disadvantage of from 25 to 35 per cent.

The following is a table which speaks for itself:

Comparison of Canadian and United States tariff.

	Canadian tariff.	United States tariff.
Earthenware.....	15 per cent.	60 per cent.
Tin plate.....	Free.	45 per cent.
Tinware.....	15 per cent.	Do.
Wire:		
Some kinds.....	Free.	
None over.....	10 per cent.	75 cents per 100 pounds.
Hats.....	20 per cent.	55 per cent.
Sugar.....	35 per cent.	80 per cent.
Carpets.....	17½ per cent.	60 per cent.
Oilcloth.....	25 per cent.	45 per cent.
Furniture.....	20 per cent.	35 per cent.
Cotton cloth.....	25 per cent.	50 to 60 per cent.
Soap.....	65 cents per 100 pounds	50 per cent.
Gloves and mitts.....	22½ per cent.	60 per cent.
Hose.....	25 per cent.	70 cents per dozen pairs and 15 per cent. to \$5 per dozen pairs and 55 per cent.
Dress goods.....	15 per cent.	60 per cent.
Automobile farm trucks.....	22 per cent.	45 per cent.
Pianos.....	20 per cent.	Do.
Celluloid goods:		
Some kinds.....	Free.	
None over.....	5 per cent.	60 per cent.
Cement.....	do.	10 per cent.
Underclothing.....	22½ per cent.	45 per cent.
Salt.....	Free.	11 cents per 100 pounds.
Axes.....	15 per cent.	45 per cent.
Shovels.....	20 per cent.	Do.
Scythes.....	15 per cent.	Do.
Stoves.....	do.	Do.
Chains (iron).....	5 per cent.	45 per cent and up.
Knives and forks.....	20 per cent.	50 to 65 per cent.
Agate ware.....	22½ per cent.	40 per cent.
Sewing machines.....	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Oranges.....	Free.	1 cent per pound and 30 per cent on the package.
Lemons.....	do.	1½ cents per pound and 30 per cent on the package.
Window glass.....	7½ per cent.	\$2 to 75 per cent.
Rice.....	50 per cent per 100 pounds.	\$2 per 100 pounds.
Figs.....	40 cents per 100 pounds	\$1 per 100 pounds and 35 per cent.
Jute bags.....	15 per cent.	45 per cent.
Cotton thread.....	17½ per cent.	Do.
Glassware.....	15 per cent.	60 to 100 per cent.
Lamp chimneys.....	20 per cent.	60 per cent.
Brass goods.....	do.	45 per cent.
Lamps.....	do.	45 to 60 per cent.
Baskets.....	Free.	40 to 60 per cent.
Rubber coats.....	15 per cent.	35 per cent.
Rubber boots and shoes.....	do.	Do.
Books.....	do.	25 per cent.
Lead.....	Free.	23 cents per pound.
Clocks and watches.....	20 per cent.	40 to 60 per cent.
Bicycles.....	do.	45 per cent.

Much is said about the place where the price of wheat is fixed. Let us assume alone, for the sake of argument, that the President is right, and the time is fast approaching when we will become importers of foodstuffs instead of exporters, then it follows we borrow the day by the passage of the reciprocity agreement to not only shut out our wheat, as can be demonstrated, from the Liverpool market, but bring the products from Canada into our home-market place to compete with ours.

If the figures given are correct, and they are if the Government reports are to be relied upon, then, by the terms of the

agreement, the prediction of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] will come true that we of the West and Middle West must soon turn our wheat fields into "truck-garden patches." [Laughter.]

The following is a table showing the wheat statistics of Canada and the United States for the years 1909 and 1910 on wheat production, home consumption, and exports, together with average yield per acre for 1909:

	Wheat statistics.	Bushels.
Wheat produced in United States, 1910.....		691,767,000
Wheat exported.....	bushels..... 24,257,392	
Flour exported (8,370,251 barrels).....	do..... 35,666,129	
		59,923,521
Wheat consumed in United States.....		631,843,479
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909.....		166,744,000
Wheat exported.....	bushels..... 49,000,000	
Flour exported (1,000,000 barrels).....	do..... 4,500,000	
		53,500,000
Wheat consumed in Canada.....		113,244,000
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909.....		166,744,000
Wheat produced in Manitoba.....	bushels..... 52,706,000	
Wheat produced in Saskatchewan.....	do..... 85,197,000	
Wheat produced in Alberta.....	do..... 9,579,000	
		147,482,000
Wheat produced in remainder of Canada.....		19,262,000

The three Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced this yield of wheat with less than 12,000,000 acres under cultivation. They have an available area suited to the cultivation of wheat of 220,000,000 acres.

	Bushels.
Average yield of wheat per acre, Canada, 1909.....	21½
Average yield of wheat per acre, United States, 1909.....	15½

A fair idea may be gained as to what the future will bring forth under free-cereal exchange between the two countries by observing what was the relative position of the two countries last year respecting the principal cereals, wheat and oats. It is as follows:

	Bushels.
Wheat imported into Canada.....	54,964
Wheat imported into the United States.....	152,383
Oats imported into Canada.....	23,361
Oats imported into the United States.....	946,479

The merest tyro in economics will correctly solve the problem that if the world's consumption amounts to only so many bushels, that the production of a bushel more will lower the price. If Canada can take away from us even a part of the foreign market, it lowers our price, and when she goes beyond that and invades our home market, she will indeed drive our farmers out of the business of growing wheat at a profit. [Applause.]

But, it is said in answer, only the border States and near-by markets will be immediately involved. We reply that our interests are interwoven; that the same degree of patriotism abides in our hearts as it did in the hearts of the founders of this Government when they were confronted with the situation that moved them to resolve to hang together to avoid being hanged separately. [Applause.]

All I have said applies to the oat, barley, potato, and milk production of that country. But, it is said, admitting these things you say are true, the time of their fruition is a long way off. Even if this were true, in behalf of the tolling third of the Nation I say that Congress is charged with the duty not only of passing laws for the welfare of its present citizens, but for the future ones as well, and at all times the overflow of the cornucopia should be allowed to remain at home.

But, to continue. Already the flower of our country has been robbed of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 emigrants, and "the end is not yet." I find in my mail this morning the latest advice on this subject:

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION RETURNS.

The minister of the interior at Ottawa states that the immigrants into Canada from April, 1910, to February last numbered 275,000. The number of British immigrants was 104,000, the arrivals from the Continent numbered 60,000, and those from the United States 107,000. The increase in British immigration over the corresponding period of the previous year was 109 per cent. Continental immigrants increased by 53 per cent, and United States 24 per cent. The increase in the total immigration in the same period was 54 per cent. Immigration from the United States during March showed a large increase over the same month last year.

We offer the bounties I have only barely suggested for these people to run away. We lose not only the personnel of their citizenship, but the help they owe us to pay off our immense war and other debts. We, moreover, enable them to build up an alien empire, whose citizens will soon come into sharp competition with their kindred at home. Their expatriation serves as well also to exempt them from the duty of shouldering a musket for our national defense should the occasion ever arise. But it is objected that these Canadian lands will be, neverthe-

less, some day occupied. This may be conceded, but why borrow the day by the giving of these immense advantages to this foreign country at such a frightful expense to our own prosperity? Many forget that our own country is not yet fully occupied; that knowledge of the soils and their adaptability is yet in its infancy; that improved farming methods have not yet been fully adopted so as to insure a maximum production which will for years to come be sufficient for our home consumption, and, but for this untoward event, enable us to compete in the open markets of the world with our surplus.

Let me call your attention for a moment to the fact that we have in this country, untouched by the plow, 711,986,409 acres of unappropriated and unsurveyed lands, and in addition thereto, in round numbers, about 200,000,000 acres of agricultural, timber, grazing, and mineral lands in the forest reserves.

I want to point out that, together with bounties offered for the occupation of the Canadian lands, there is a corresponding discouragement to the occupation and development of our own. Our Government has, contrary to all precedent, gone into the business of capitalizing for revenue purposes every natural product of the undisposed part of the public domain. This is illustrated by the separation of estates of coal land—leasing the coal right and enforcing new and such burdensome regulations for obtaining titles to the surface as well as title to the balance of the agricultural domain, and a legion of other innovations and obstacles, such as leasing the grazing land, selling the timber right—all operating to drive the homeseeker away. In my State alone last year it is estimated that 75,000 homeseekers were so discouraged at the prospect of a successful contest with the Government to obtain a home that they turned back and went to Canada. The same restrictions are thrown around obtaining title to mineral land, and the development of that portion of the public domain has ceased.

Why drive our citizens to a foreign country instead of giving them a home in their own? Why exempt this vast domain from the taxing power? Why keep in hiding its great mineral resources? [Applause.] But this is another story, to which I expect shortly, on another occasion, to draw the attention of the House.

Some economists of the altruistic type point to the fact that Canada is a great and growing country—is largely now and will continue to be a field for the expansion of our trade. They do not see in this argument a contradiction of their brother helpers in the passage of this agreement, whose main claim is that the farmers can not be hurt because of the inability of Canada to produce anything that would come into competition with their products; and along this line an appeal has been made to the farmers of the Middle West to cease their complaining for the present, because the agreement will afford immediate market for their live stock.

The figures of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] have been juggled with for that purpose, but, in this connection, it should be borne in mind the exportation of live stock in that direction could of necessity be only of short duration, such as is temporarily incident to the settlement of all new countries. And the figures are misleading, because the tide has already set in the other way, for last year the value of horses shipped from Canada into the United States was \$484,560, or \$86,657 more than the value of those we sent into Canada, the tariff of both countries being the same. How about cattle? The exports are \$25,150; the imports, \$109,772, or \$84,622 more than the value of those we sent to Canada, the tariff of both countries being the same.

Therefore the outlook for the expansion of trade so far as stock raisers are concerned is "nipped in the bud" at the threshold. But when we come to the interests of the manufacturer there seems to be a firm foundation for the argument that the agreement will offer the means of great expansion for their trade. The great Steel Trust is given absolute free trade with Canada; the great Agricultural Implement Trust and the Automobile Trust have favorable reciprocal tariff duties on their goods. The exports into Canada last year by the Steel Trust amounted to \$2,476,930 in value. The imports of these products from Canada for the same year in value was only \$15,088. Agricultural implements exported last year to Canada amounted to \$5,151,870, and there was only imported into this country from Canada \$84,618 in value. Of automobiles there was exported \$1,764,089 worth and none imported.

Based upon last year's exportation of agricultural implements, with the reduction in duty fixed by this agreement, the great Agricultural Implement Trust is presented with the nice little sum of over \$250,000, and the automobile manufacturers, with the reduced duty fixed by the agreement, is presented with the nice little sum of over \$80,000, and the list, when followed through, results in finding like benefits to other manufacturers.

We remit to Canada, based on last year's importations, the round sum of approximately \$5,000,000, which sum must be recouped in some way to be devised by the Ways and Means Committee, in order to relieve the taxpayers of this country for the loss of that revenue. On the other hand, Canada remits in round numbers only \$2,500,000. This is in the ratio of one to two, and yet it is called "reciprocity." [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I must hasten along, and I shall not, I observe, have the time I would like to go into detail explaining how our stock growers are affected by the trade agreement. I know something of their condition—what they have had to contend with in the past and the problems confronting them now. They do not belong to a trust; they are the victims of a trust. They have felt the fangs of that trust as well as the ultimate consumer of their product. You did the stock grower a grievous wrong when you robbed him of from \$1.50 to \$2.50 (aggregating millions of dollars) upon every cow or steer that met its death either in the bog or on the block by taking the duty off of hides. He told you then, through me on this floor, that the blow, although aimed at the trust, would be received by him. He tells you now, through me, that your letting into this country from Canada live stock free of duty, although aimed at the trusts, will be nevertheless received by him. [Applause.]

In proof of this let me digress to ask you if any of you have received a single letter from, or inspired by, the Beef Trust protesting against the measure, and how many basketfuls the janitors of your offices have emptied of letters in protest from the stock growers? And whilst on this subject of letters and petitions received by you, let me ask you how many letters in protest did you receive from the Harvester Trust, the Steel Trust, the Automobile Trust, the metropolitan press, the oatmeal mills, the middle men, and, lastly, the maltsters. Yes; did you hear the brewers' voice in protest? No; and can it be possible that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of a Republican President, likewise is about to forsake another of its tried and true friends for the malted kind? Alas, what misfortunes have fallen athwart our pathway! [Laughter and applause.]

You seek to parry the blow by allowing the free importation of live stock only from Canada, but have you thought out the possibility of the building of packing houses on the opposite side of the Rio Grande by the great Meat Trust and availing itself of the free-meat clause of the pending bill, bringing into competition indirectly the cattle of Mexico, and the very same may be said of Argentina and Australasia.

The Massachusetts commission said something on this subject also. After quieting the fears of those engaged in manufacturing in its State, and demonstrating that Canada could not compete with them, it said:

These will at least not be discouraged if we can make it possible for our people to buy their food in the cheapest market. If Canada chances to profit by supplying our needs to some small extent, so much the better both for Canada and for ourselves. But there is no reason why we should restrict our new purchases to Canada. If Mexico, or Argentina, or Australasia can help us out, let us turn to them as well.

There is not a syllable of sentiment, not a thought of kind remembrance for that third of our population which year in and year out have to these many years meekly suffered under the fleecing knife to fill the exchequer of protected interests, not a word of sympathy accompanying this adieu. The "jack-knife" is theirs. Out, out, I say, upon such marble, cursed be the quality of such greed, ingratitude, and inordinate avarice! [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a revision of the tariff—a downward revision, to a revenue basis. But the burdens of taxation must be equally distributed, it must not be spotted; and I am not entirely enamored with the beginning under the direction of the Ways and Means Committee, for I am curious to know what is going to become of the hindmost man. The thought of the farmer is: "What will the harvest be?"

We have thus far seen that the Canadians have been presented with \$5,000,000 of our revenue. The cotton States will be given under the pending bill more than half of the \$10,000,000 in revenue we lose by this bill. Scarcely any of the benefits of the reduced duties provided in this bill will reach the other farming population.

I know you say they will get the benefits of the reduction in the products of leather, but we say that benefit was sought to be discounted when you took the duty off of hides, and neither you nor we received any. And, what is more, the revenue we are deprived of by the Canadian agreement and the present bill must be raised by increasing the taxes upon other imports, and the farmer is anxiously waiting and watching to see if in the end he is not again to be made the victim. I warn you here and now, I will stand as a rock against any further invasion of their rights. [Applause.]

We know that the export trade of meat, and especially the hoof exportation, is practically monopolized by frozen meats from Australasia and Argentina, and you seem to forget that the great beef trusts own and operate plants there, so why not in Mexico? Meat can be frozen in the Tropics as well as in the frozen north and as cheaply. What, then, will become of our cattle growers when you let in from Canada the live animals and from the other countries the dead ones? You will simply catch the stock raiser a-coming and a-going. [Laughter.]

The distinguished gentlemen who have spoken in favor of the agreement, and especially the gentlemen from Massachusetts, were kind enough to tell us what would become of the farmer, what he could turn his hand to, namely, "truck farming," but they have not essayed to advise the millions of stock raisers what we may have the liberty to do for a livelihood. I object to this reckless oversight on the part of our Massachusetts friends. [Laughter.]

But, it is said, you have no occasion to be alarmed about the cattle business of Canada. The country is too cold, the seasons are too short, corn will not grow, and so forth; hence, cattle raising can not be successfully carried on. I admit that the emblem of the Republican Party, with its loss at the last election of its few remaining hairs, would not enjoy the climate and might stray from the reservation, but the emblem of Democracy, I take it, would don a new coat in as short a time as the party itself has since the election shown such an inclination to do. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have imported cattle from Canada for personal use for breeding purposes. I know their value, and the thick coat of hair, a resistant to the severe cold of that region, nature has abundantly provided. I also know how quickly nature in this respect provides for animals exported to that country, and that calves can be shipped from Mexico by rail to Canada, and when they are 3 years old they will have taken on as much as 300 pounds more than they would have in their old environment—more than enough to pay for the freight and their keeping. These cattle will come into free competition with the cattle grown in this country, either in the home or European market.

In concluding this subject, I want to remind you that you have been told the corn-belt section of our country will be benefited by the free importation of cattle. I do not believe such will be the case. It is cheaper to fatten cattle upon grass than upon grain, and Canada can fatten her cattle upon grass even for export. Last year she exported \$11,000,000 worth of grass-fattened cattle. She can ship from export points to Liverpool cheaper than corn-fed cattle can be shipped from Illinois to New York, and if she can do this, can she not take our market here from our own cattle growers?

I am here reminded that I promised you to give my views on what was meant by the words "and for other purposes." I will now make a shadowy stagger in that direction. Many men upon both sides have essayed to give a reason why the reciprocity agreement was brought before this House at this time and from what source it really emanated, and why it should be adopted. It will be remembered that the treaty of 1854 was before the American people three years before the Senate passed upon it. I want to call further attention to the fact that this is not called a treaty. Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson, the envoys on the part of the Dominion of Canada, took care to warn the President and Secretary Knox not to call it a treaty; not to undertake to pass a treaty. They said, "The desired tariff change shall not take the formal shape of a treaty." And I may say, by way of parenthesis, if this has the force and effect of a treaty, though not in form such, then all you have done amounts to nothing, because section 2 of Article II of the Constitution provides that treaties can only be made by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. They were correctly advised at this end of the line that a two-thirds vote of the Senate could not be obtained for a treaty.

But it came here within 14 days after the envoys came from Ottawa. They had only 14 days of discussion upon it. The President, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Fielding, and the Secretary of State took care to take no one here into their confidences, and that such a program was on foot was unknown outside of the President and the Secretary of State until the President's message came to this House within five days after they had concluded the conference. I put it up to anyone of you Members if you were able to digest this instrument as you would like to in that time. It came like a meteor from ethereal space, the only difference in the analogy being that we know the substance of this but we do not know the substance of the meteor nor from whence it was gathered.

Now, some say it was incubated by the Massachusetts commission, and I told my people back in my country that the findings of that commission would become the forerunner of such a measure. But others have said it was inspired by the

great trust manufacturing interests. Others have said that it was the metropolitan press; and there has been the confusion of tongues on this subject to which I have already referred.

I have a notion of firing the other barrel of my shotgun—I am sometimes known as "Shotgun RUCKER." [Laughter and applause.] I fired one of the barrels out in Colorado before the election. I am going to undertake to pull the trigger of the other. After a very formal shaking of hands and a perfunctory passing of the compliments of the day Uncle Jonathan said, "Now, wily, winsome, but willful, Willie, don't say anything more about that peace treaty. I am not going to talk about that now. You went off over there into that new country"—[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like 10 minutes more.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. "But you went off over there into that country and declared you would never engage in entangling alliances with any other nation. You took over that Monroe doctrine, contrary to my advice. You went into the colonial business, thinking you were as smart as your old daddy, and you got into all sorts of trouble. And now your Mexico difficulty. But, my son, I am not bereft of all filial affection, so I will tell you what I will do. I will just extend one of those due bills of Japan, and get her promise that she will not take the Philippines away from you—for a while yet, at least, until you get the Mexico troubles off your hands. [Laughter.] Now, I won't do anything more at present, and you needn't say another word, but I will tell you what you must do: Now, don't say anything more about a treaty, because that word 'treaty' is becoming a very, very delicate and serious subject all over the world, and especially with me with all those past-due bills of Japan on hand; but you have some cousins over there—those Canadian people—and we want to get some stuff over here to live on cheaper than you Americans are letting us have it for, and we want you to let those trusts of yours have a free hand among them; let your farmers go over there and settle up the country, and then I will talk to you later about the peace treaty. But, be quiet about it, Willie, because you know what a thinking and inflammable people you Americans are, and they may get it into their heads that they may have to sell us cheaper stuff, too; therefore, don't breathe a word of this before you have everything cocked and primed, for if you do, Willie, you can't carry it through. Don't detain me any longer, sonny; the roof of the east wing of the old house has sprung a leak and I must go up and put a plug in it. So, good day." [Laughter and applause.]

And, Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes, for the sake of the country, and especially for the Democratic Party, that the agreement will fail at the other end of this Capitol. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret my colleagues from my State were not at liberty to avail themselves of the caucus rule that was open to me, but for them I will say they will always be found on the side of the right when afforded the opportunity. Each of them is not only a true representative of our State and ever on the alert to serve its interests, but the peer of any in this body in knowing the demands of the country and in having the courage to evidence their convictions on this floor. [Applause.]

I have not time to read the hundreds of demands made by the organizations in which I have the honor of membership to oppose the Canadian agreement, nor the hundreds of compliments I have received for my devotion to their interests; but beyond that, in conclusion, I will say my conscience has been the mentor controlling me in this as it ever has and will continue to be in all my votes. I will continue to put in practice the teachings of our distinguished Speaker: "He serves his party best who serves his country best." [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the interest manifest in this debate is truly marvelous. With all of the seats filled and every gentleman listening attentively, I fully believe that when the time comes to vote upon the bill every Member of the House will be able to vote intelligently, assuming, of course, that the discussion upon the bill is along lines that are calculated to enlighten the membership of the House on the merits of the question. It is encouraging to realize that an opportunity is given to me to present the case from my standpoint under such favorable auspices. I am inspired with the enthusiasm and attention of the audience [applause], and I have no doubt that because of the interest manifested I will be able to tell those gentlemen who are present something which they will be glad to take home with them and think about. [Applause.]

I voted for the reciprocity bill when it was presented by the Republican House in the last Congress, and I am glad of it. I have no apology for having done so. I voted for the bill, which is practically equivalent to that, presented by the House now controlled by the Democrats. I doubt very much whether I would have voted for the reciprocity bill in either House had I believed that the farming communities of Canada were able to compete with the farmers of America.

I realize that the farm lands of Canada are not capable of raising the diversified crops that the farm lands of the United States are capable of raising, and I never had any serious idea that Canada had the ability to come into very sharp competition with the farmer of the United States. We have farm lands in this country where we can raise tropical and temperate zone cereals in the same fields, and no such conditions exist anywhere else on earth. The farm lands of Canada are devoted largely to the production of wheat, and the farmer engaged in this enterprise can only employ his time and his capital a very short period of every year, whereas a farmer of the United States, having the prolific soil and the magnificent climate to enable him to raise diversified crops, is able to employ his time and his capital nearly every day of the year. So, with these advantageous conditions in favor of the American farmer, I have no fear of any serious detriment coming to him as the result of legislation allowing the Canadian farm products to enter the United States free. The people of the United States and the people of Canada are substantially the same. Their hopes and their fears and their disappointments and their ambitions are alike.

They live along the same lines, they speak the same tongue, they think the same thoughts, and the only difference between them and ourselves is that we live in a land where every citizen is a sovereign, where every man is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, where labor is exalted to comfortable homes, where the printing press and the church follow close upon the march of empire, where caste is ignored, and where the humblest child of poverty may aspire unrebuked to the highest place in the gift of the Nation; whereas they live in a land where no such opportunities prevail, and my hope is that if we can have close commercial relations with this homogeneous people that some day this close commercial relationship may blend the two people into one harmonious whole, and that the territory lying north of the northern boundary line of the United States may become a part of the United States, as it should be. And that is no idle dream with me. I have always believed we should be one people, under one flag, under one form of government; and it will be better for us all when such a thing happens, if it ever does. But, however that may be, I believe we should have not only reciprocity with Canada because of the conditions which I have attempted to describe, but I really believe that if the question related alone to Canada and the United States that we should have absolute free trade between the two nations. But the question of free trade with the world is quite another proposition.

I am not prepared to believe that we should open the American market to the products of the world. We have had some experience with Democratic legislation along tariff lines even during my short existence, and I can recollect very well when in the great cities of the country we were obliged to establish soup houses on the street corners in order to be able in a measure to appease the hunger of those who were willing to work but were unable to find it. The people of the country are beginning to think about what you Democrats are attempting to do, and I warn you that they are going to think seriously upon this subject; and when they realize, as they must soon, that you are going to do the things which have always been done under Democratic rule, namely, to close the American workshops while you open the workshops of Europe, they are going to come back to the grand old Republican Party and vote for that kind of prosperity which every Democrat as well as every Republican loves to enjoy. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Republicans claim no patent right to the enjoyment of prosperity. All they claim a patent right to is the creation of prosperity; and we have that right, but we are always glad to invite our Democratic brethren to come in with us and enjoy a good square meal at a well-spread table. What we object to in the Democratic program is the fact that while they create a condition of adversity, they compel us to participate in that adversity.

I hope the time is not far distant when the people will realize the importance and the necessity of coming back into the fold of that grand old party which has always given the country prosperity, whereas Democratic policy and Democratic legislation has always created a condition of adversity throughout every section of the land. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman, speaking for the Republican Party, recall a single time in the history of the country where we have had prosperity under Republican rule that Democrats, Prohibitionists, and Socialists alike have not benefited equally with Republicans under that rule?

Mr. MADDEN. The glory of the Republican Party policy is that it has always been able to create prosperity and every class, Democrats, Republicans, and Socialists, have participated in that prosperity.

The present bill under consideration, being H. R. 4413, to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the leader of the majority side of this House, is an entirely different proposition. It is an out-and-out free-trade measure and, if enacted into law, will open our doors to free-trade Europe and glut our markets with the products of poorly paid European labor, and bring about a business stagnation such as we have always experienced whenever the Democrats undertake to revise or amend a Republican tariff bill.

I thought, Mr. Chairman, when I learned that the gentleman from Alabama intended to introduce this measure that the people would regard it as a joke; that it would not be considered seriously; that it could not possibly pass the Senate of the United States as now organized, and that it would serve simply as an excuse for the elimination, by certain Members, of a surplusage of bile and hot air, thereby bringing them back to their normal condition; and that that would be the end of it. Not so, however. According to the newspapers—and concerning such matters the newspapers are usually right—the business people as well as the laboring people are regarding this proposed legislation as a very serious matter. The cry of alarm comes not only from one locality, but from every section of our country. From the gentleman's [Mr. UNDERWOOD] own district there comes the word that if this bill is enacted into law the doors of the great steel works there will be closed and that thousands of men will be thrown out of employment. If this be true, and I doubt it not, the suffering of the families of these employees will become distressing beyond measure, and the entire business community will suffer irreparable injury.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is no joke after all. The mere mention of Democratic tariff tinkering causes widespread alarm, and is a just warning for all classes of intelligent business men to run to cover, and it is going to be very difficult, in my opinion, for the press, having, as it does, great faith in the Senate of the United States, composed as it is by a Republican majority, to educate the people up to the belief that this bill is, after all, nothing but a joke, that the Senate will never concur in its provisions, and even though it should, the President, unless he be intoxicated with the idea of universal reciprocity, will never sign it. All power to the press, if it can calm the people and restore temporary confidence until they can have a chance to undo the evil they were guilty of in electing a Democratic majority of this body.

This is my first opportunity to watch at close range a Democratic operation on a tariff bill, and I do not wonder at the alarm evinced by the old-timers as they observe the recklessness with which the knife is manipulated as they slash in and about its vitals. They do not seem to have received their early training in a school which teaches that the best way to build up a system in order to save the patient is to gradually cut away the affected parts, but rather in one which teaches that the way to cure what is believed to be a sick body is to cut off its head, and that, Mr. Chairman, is what these Democratic surgeons are going to do.

I do not know whether the Speaker of this House personally favors this decapitation process or not, although I heard him make a speech on the floor of this House that he would, could he have his own way about it, tear down every customhouse in the United States. So I take it that he not only favors the lopping off of the head of the protection giant, but will take a prominent part in the grand lopping-off act. No one who has had the great pleasure of hearing his gentle voice or has been privileged to observe the meekness with which he handles his political adversaries would ever believe it, and I will not believe it until I hear him in one of his incomparable speeches deny it, or until I hear him vote aye on the passage of this measure.

Democrats say that this bill and the reciprocity bill will reduce the revenue of the Treasury \$15,000,000 annually; and

if so, that the price to the consumer will be reduced by the amount of the reduction in the tax. If that be true, the cost of living would be reduced exactly 15 cents per person per annum, because if you divide \$15,000,000 into 90,000,000 you get 6, and one-sixth of 90 is 15, which means 15 cents to every individual in the United States. So, even if they do carry out the plan which they propose, and the tariff is a tax, and the price of the article is reduced by the amount of the tax when the tax is taken off, the total saving to each individual in the United States on the cost of living will be 15 cents per annum. Marvelous! Marvelous!

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman submit to an inquiry?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly; I will be delighted to do so.

Mr. SIMS. As I understand you, the reduction of the revenue paid into the Treasury will be 15 cents per person; but what about the cost of the domestic article which the home people consume?

Mr. MADDEN. If the tariff is a tax and the tax is added to the price of the article, as the Democrats claim it is, and if that tax is taken off the article and therefore taken off the price of the article when the tax is reduced, the reduction in the cost of the article will be exactly the amount of the tax taken off, and you can not reduce the cost of living any more than the difference between the tax when it is on and the tax when it is off.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure, in a moment. I think, Mr. Chairman, before I yield that I should say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] that if we open our markets to free-trade Europe and let them open their mills to make goods for American consumption, we must close our mills in order to be able to consume the goods shipped here by Europe, and if we do that, even though the price be reduced by reason of the fact that the goods are made abroad under the free-trade rate of wages and shipped into America for consumption by the American people, it would reduce the ability of the Americans to buy; and the result would be that it would not make any difference, even if the price is lowered, if we have nothing with which to pay the lower price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. I do, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Last week, in the city of Philadelphia, was sold the machinery of the Southwark Woolen Mills, which had formerly employed upward of a thousand workmen and women. The sale was completed on Saturday, and it is reported that many of the purchasers had come over from Canada, and that the machinery, in large part, will now be transported to that country. Does not the gentleman, in carrying out his discussion with regard to wages, observe that this would answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee, and that there will be no reduction in the cost of living here if we decrease the wage-earning power of the people?

Mr. MADDEN. Without doubt, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman, using the Democratic argument that the price is increased to the consumer by precisely the amount of the duty exacted, and then reversing that, estimates that the cost of living to the 92,000,000 people of this country will be reduced by 15 cents per head, saying he arrived at that conclusion by adding together the effect of the reciprocity measure and this so-called free-trade bill. I ask the gentleman if in the course of his compilation he has ascertained just how much the consumer will gain from the effect of reciprocity, separated from this free-trade bill?

Mr. MADDEN. It would be one-third of the 15 cents—5 cents [laughter on the Republican side]—if we assume that the logic of the Democrats be true. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the entire revenue of the country derived from the tariff for the last fiscal year—1910—was approximately \$331,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; or, in other words, \$3 per capita.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Three dollars and seventy-five cents per capita, was it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; about \$3, in round figures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If one of our friends on the other side would abstain from at least one theater party, would not his portion of the tax be paid, so far as he is concerned?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not be fair to assume that he indulges in such a luxurious privilege as going to the theater. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that it is a fact that I saw the other day on one of the broad highways of Washington, flanked on either side by magnificent buildings, a real, live Democrat riding in an automobile. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we have some plutocrats among the Democrats, who are always railing against the so-called trusts, while at the same time they are indulging in the privileges and luxuries of the dividends derived from the so-called trusts. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the wages derived from the industries of this country could be put upon a free-trade basis, and manufacturers given time in which to adjust their business matters accordingly, and if the laboring men and mechanics and artisans and everybody interested would be agreeable to the change, the pending measure would be popular. But for how many more years will we be compelled to tell you that the American workman will tolerate no such change by his own consent? What American bricklayer, for instance, would consent to work for \$1.68 a day? That is the wage paid in Great Britain to bricklayers. Or what American bricklayer would work for \$1.04 a day, which is the amount paid in Germany and France? In Belgium the bricklayer receives only 64 cents a day.

If you were to insult an American bricklayer by handing him on Saturday night \$3.84 as his pay for a week's work, someone else would pay off the next week. [Applause on the Republican side.] The American bricklayer receives for one day's work more than that. As a matter of fact, the average wage paid to American bricklayers is \$4.40 a day.

I will print here, Mr. Chairman, some interesting tables, showing the difference between the wages received here and in foreign countries, also a comparison of the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain, and Belgium, and a comparison of the wages of labor employed in woolen manufacture in the United States, France, and Italy:

	United States.		Great Britain.		Germany.		France.		Belgium.	
	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.
Bricklayers.....	\$0.55	\$4.40	\$0.21	\$1.68	\$0.13	\$1.04	\$0.13	\$1.04	\$0.08	\$0.64
Stonecutters.....	.42	3.36	.20	1.60	.12	.96	.14	1.12	.07	.56
Stonemasons.....	.46	3.68	.21	1.68	.13	1.04	.14	1.12	.08	.64
Hod carriers.....	.29	2.32	.13	1.04	.08	.64	.10	.80	No data.	
Carpenters.....	.36	2.88	.20	1.60	.13	1.04	.15	1.20	.07	.56
Painters.....	.35	2.80	.18	1.44	.12	.96	.13	1.04	.07	.56
Plumbers.....	.44	3.52	.20	1.60	.11	.88	.15	1.20	.08	.64
Machinists.....	.27	2.16	.17	1.36	.13	1.04	.13	1.04	No data.	
General laborers.....	.17	1.36	.10	.80	.08	.64	.10	.80	.05	.40

A comparison of the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain and Belgium.

Articles.	United States.		Great Britain.		Belgium.	
	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.
1 yard cashmere cloth of cotton and low botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost).....	\$0.064	\$0.195	\$0.013	\$0.143
1 yard cashmere cloth of cotton and botany worsted of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost).....	.004	.135	.015	.163
1 yard all-wool saten of botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost).....	.058	.65	.014	.30
1,000 common red building brick.	2.33	1.91	\$0.65	\$0.69
1 dozen ivory-handled table knives, practically same size, American make best English steel, English make ordinary steel.....	.94	7.18	.85	3.65
1 dozen knife blades used for above knives.....	.63	.55	.445	.40
1 gross green glass spirit bottles, equal capacity and weight.....	1.88	2.25	1.15	1.91
1 ton (2,240 pounds) Hematite pig iron.....	1.23	9.43	.79	11.25
1 dozen plain ironstone-china plates equal size, American make half ounce heavier.....	.22	.24	.15	.21
1 dozen plain cups and saucers same size, style, and weight.....	.23	.25	.12	.36

A comparison of the wages of labor employed in woolen manufacture in the United States, England, France, and Italy.

	Italy.	France.	England.	United States.
Sorters.....	\$4.60	\$6.40	\$7.30	\$12.50
Washers or dyers.....	3.00	4.25	5.00	7.00
Carders.....	2.30	4.00	3.90	6.00
Gill boxes.....	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Comb minders.....	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Boss spinner.....	7.00	9.25	12.60	18.00
Mule spinner.....	5.80	6.20	7.30	9.50
Ring spinner.....	2.30	4.00	3.00	6.00
Weavers.....	3.00	4.60	4.00	9.00
Fullers and pressers.....	3.50	4.25	6.00	7.00

The above tables tell the truth, Mr. Chairman; and being true, it is beyond my understanding how any intelligent legislator can have the hardihood to tell the American laboring man that it is to his interest to support a party which is in favor of reducing the wage scale to the level of that adopted by free-trade Europe. They do not tell him that in so many words, but it is exactly the condition they will bring him to if they succeed in enacting into law the bill now under consideration.

This bill provides that certain articles are to come into the United States free of duty.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman a moment ago referred to "free-trade Europe." Just so that the record may be kept straight and his speech properly illuminated, is it not a fact that "free-trade Europe" means free trade with America and protection in Europe, in every country thereof?

Mr. MADDEN. Without any doubt.

Mr. SIMS. Except England.

Mr. MADDEN. While we under this bill admit free everything made in Europe or grown in Europe, we are obliged to pay the tariff tax imposed by the European countries on everything that we sell to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And then is not that substantially the situation with regard to Canada—that most of their duties are retained, whereas many of ours are being taken off?

Mr. MADDEN. That is true; and if I had had my way when the reciprocity bill was under consideration I would like to have amended it in very many particulars. Take, for example, the raw materials entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements, farm wagons, hoop and band iron, cotton ties, wire for baling, fence wire, and sewing machines. Listen to the absurdity of this. This bill now under consideration provides that all the things I have enumerated are to be admitted into this country free, whereas the materials which enter into their construction bear a tariff tax; and here is a list of the taxes that are to be paid on the materials which enter into the construction of these articles, if the materials are to be imported by a man who manufactures the same kind of articles in this country:

Dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements, farm wagons, hoop and band iron, cotton ties, wire for baling, fence wire, and sewing machines.

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
117	Iron ore.....	15 cents per ton.
118	Iron in pigs.....	\$2.50 per ton.
	Wrought and cast scrap iron, and scrap steel.....	\$1 per ton.
119	Bar iron.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound.
123	Ball bearings and roller bearings.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
127	Sheets of iron or steel, black: Valued at 3 cents per pound or less.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent to $\frac{3}{4}$ cent per pound.
	Valued at more than 3 cents per pound.....	30 per cent ad valorem.
129	Sheets of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glazed.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.
131	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs; billets and bars; hammered molds; mill shafting; alloys used as substitutes for steel in the manufacture of tools; steel castings: If valued at 40 cents per pound or less.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent to 7 cents per pound.
	If valued above 40 cents per pound.....	20 per cent ad valorem.
142	Axles or parts thereof.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound.
144	Bolts.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.
148	Castings of malleable iron.....	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound.
206	Hubs for wheels, and wagon blocks.....	20 per cent ad valorem.

Does anyone imagine for a moment that a man engaged in manufacturing these parts of agricultural implements in American factories can continue in the business in which he is engaged if by legislation we allow the finished article to come into this country free? Does anybody suppose that the men employed in making the parts which enter into the construction of these agricultural implements in this country can compete with the men who make agricultural implements abroad under such conditions? It is absurd. This bill is a fraud and a humbug. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman suppose we are going to stop at this little free-list bill and not make reductions all along the line when we have time?

Mr. MADDEN. I was not educated in the school which gives me the ability to see into the minds of Democrats, and I am only talking about the thing which they present to me for consideration. If the gentleman from Tennessee can tell me what his party is going to do on any given subject for any given hour of any given day, I will say to him that he has more information than any other member of his party.

Mr. SIMS. We are going to pass this bill, and then we are going to make other reductions.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is fair to assume that they are going on in the exuberance of destruction which they have started.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, for example, let us consider the raw materials entering into the manufacture of cotton bagging, burlaps, and bags, which, I assume, the gentleman from Tennessee is interested in having put on the free list. For example, the dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of burlaps and bags are as follows:

Dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of cotton bagging, burlaps, and bags.

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
333	Flax straw.....	\$5 per ton.
334	Flax, not hackled or dressed.....	1 cent per pound.
335	Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line".....	3 cents per pound.
336	Flax, tow of.....	\$20 per ton.
337	Hemp.....	\$22.50 per ton.
	Hemp, hackled, known as line of hemp.....	\$45 per ton.
338	Single yarns made of jute.....	1 cent per pound and 10 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.
340	Threads and twine made from yarn of flax, hemp, or ramie: Not finer than 5 lea.....	10 cents per pound.
	Finer than 5 lea.....	12 cents per pound and $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound for each additional lea.
341	Single yarns in the gray, made of flax, hemp, or ramie: Not finer than 8 lea.....	6 cents per pound.
	Finer than 8 lea.....	15 per cent to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Will anybody tell me how the American manufacturer of these commodities can compete with the people of India, who make these same commodities and pay labor at the rate of 50 cents or less per week, when the materials which enter into the construction of the things you are putting on the free list are taxed so that the American manufacturer is put in the position of being unable to continue in the business in which he is engaged?

Now, here are some raw materials entering into the production of meats, flour, and cereal food:

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
225	Cattle: If valued at not more than \$14 per head.....	\$2 to \$3.75 per head.
	If valued at more than \$14 per head.....	27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem.
226	Swine.....	\$1.50 per head.
228	Sheep.....	75 cents to \$1.50 per head.
229	All other live animals.....	20 per cent ad valorem.
334	Buckwheat, per bushel of 48 pounds.....	15 cents.
335	Corn or maize, per bushel of 56 pounds.....	15 cents.
238	Oats.....	15 cents per bushel.
240	Rice.....	12 cents to 2 cents per pound.
241	Rye.....	10 cents per bushel.
242	Wheat.....	25 cents per bushel.

We are proposing to admit free all the meat products and food products, whereas the things that enter into them are subject to pay a high tariff in order to enter this country. Oh Democratic consistency! [Laughter on the Republican side.] You are going to reduce the cost of living. Yes; you are going to reduce the opportunity for men to earn a living. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] You are going to put the men of the country on a starvation basis. You are going to close the factories and the workshops; you are going to reduce the price of property. You are going to reduce the possibility of the sale of property. Under Democratic rule there never was sale for property in this land except sales by the sheriff. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] No sound of the hammer to be heard anywhere except the sound of the auctioneer's hammer selling farms under mortgage. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But the Democratic policy reduces the cost of living! Better give us an opportunity to make a living. We all need it. The more opportunity you can give the people of this land to make a living, the more contented and happy homes you will have in the land. [Applause on the Republican side.] I would like to have some Democrat

tell me or tell the country how we can afford to admit free of duty the commodities; that is, the finished products enumerated in this bill, while the material which enters into their construction is dutiable. If the American manufacturer is required to use any of these materials in the construction of his product, and the European manufacturer is permitted to send his product in free, how can the American manufacturer continue in business? If the American manufacturer requires any of these materials in the manufacture of his products he is compelled to pay a duty on them. He can not possibly compete with the foreign manufacturer who under this bill is permitted to ship into the United States free the finished product made of these materials.

It may be well to consider this fact for a moment. It is a fact, and you can not get away from it, the logic of events will prove the truth of what I say, and I am appealing now to the men who work with their hands and their brains in this country. I am not talking to the men who are sitting in these seats; I am appealing to the men who toil, the men who are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements, for example. The International Harvester Co., whose great plants are in Chicago, the city from which I come, have plants in Russia, in Germany, in France, in Canada. If they are allowed to bring their products free into the United States, what would prevent them from forcing a strike in their American shops, locking their men out, closing the shops, and making their agricultural implements abroad, with free-trade labor at one-quarter the price paid in the American shop? What guaranty would the American workman have that these American shops would ever be opened again? What right have we to believe that this harvester company will not do this? They are mercenary; they are anxious to make more dividends than they make now. If they can increase their dividends by employing European labor and shipping the product of that labor into the American markets for American consumption, I fear, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, that every man employed in this great industry in this country will, if this bill becomes a law, sooner or later be thrown out of employment and be cast out on the street in search of a job, with no opportunity to follow the vocation to which he has given his life.

This is a serious proposition, Mr. Chairman. We ought not to overlook the seriousness of it. It is a proposition we can not afford to overlook. It is a thing that will be done, and I warn you Democrats—I would like to save you from your own folly, for I like you personally, but you do not seem to exercise good judgment in the matter of legislation.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly; the gentleman is always gracious.

Mr. SULZER. Had the gentleman from Illinois better not tell us the heavens will fall if we touch the sacred doctrine of protection?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, the gentleman's question is hardly apropos. You know the God of the universe made the heavens, and in the order of His wisdom He has seen fit to keep them from falling upon us in the past, and I hope in the future He will have as much mercy upon us as He has for all time gone. [Applause.] I would not like to see anything fall on the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. In that connection I might say that if the gentleman pursues his line of argument I am afraid something will fall on him in his district at the next election.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say to the gentleman in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that if he does not need his job in this House any more than I need mine it will not worry him if he does not come back. I have always had the courage to express my views on public questions. I have had my own opinions and have had the courage to express them, and I have never waited for anybody to tell me what they were. If as a public functionary I am to be so restricted in the expression of my views as to be obliged to wait until I find out whether they please the people of my district or not, I would infinitely rather go back to private life and become a private citizen, with the right to express my views untrammelled and unquestioned by anybody on earth, with the right to try to formulate public sentiment along the lines of my ideas, than to hold any public office in the gift of the American people. [Applause.] I am not here looking for a job. I am here to express my views, and to represent my people as I think they should be represented, and I am not pandering to any maudlin sentiment or trying to trim my sails to every wind that blows, that I may have a popular feeling among the people in my district for my attitude as a public functionary. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have a number of documents here that I would like to have the Clerk read in my time. First, a lot of

protected articles that enter into construction of boots and shoes, and some other papers. I will ask the Clerk to read them in my time as a part of my remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota (interrupting). Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman's argument sounds good to Republican ears, but I would like to ask him whether that would not have been a good argument against opening up free trade with Canada in farm products?

Mr. MADDEN. If I thought, as I said in opening my remarks, that the Canadian farmer could in any wise compete with the American farmer, I would have voted against the reciprocity bill. I have the idea in my mind, from information which I was able to gather from something of an investigation, that the productiveness of the Canadian farm is so much less than the productiveness of the American farm that I fear no danger from the competition which may arise between them.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Without going into that question of fact, I would like the judgment of the gentleman as to whether the American manufacturers are any less able to compete with Canadian manufacturers than the American farmers with Canadian farmers.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that if I had my way I would favor an even interchange between the two countries on every commodity, both agricultural and manufactures.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, that is indirectly an answer to the question, but is not it true, speaking generally, that the American manufacturer is quite as well able, considering our natural resources and all that enters into manufacturing, to compete with the manufacturing enterprises of the world as the American farmer is to compete with the agricultural products of the world?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I would not like to admit that, because while the wages between the American farmer and the Canadian farmer are almost equivalent there may be a shade the best of it in favor of the Canadian farmer. The wages as between the American manufacturer and the European manufacturer is as two to five or as one is to five in some cases, and as two is to four in others; so that the American manufacturer pays from two to five times the wages that the European manufacturer pays.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman consider that the American farmer is not an employer as well as the manufacturer?

Mr. MADDEN. They are; but there is not that difference.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There are about 10,000,000 laborers that have their entire employment in farming, about one-third of the laboring population of this country. Do I understand the gentleman's idea to be, if he will pardon me, from his statement, that while we will conclude that the American employer ought to be protected against the employer of other countries the American farmer can afford to compete with the farm products of other countries?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am against the free admission of farm products from other countries into the United States, while I am in favor of the free admission of the products of the Canadian farmer. I consider that the free admission of the product of the Canadian farmers into the American market is equivalent to admitting the products of Indiana into the State of Illinois or the products of the State of Illinois into the State of Ohio.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Which is only another way of saying that the Canadian farmer is the only one who is in the position really to compete with the American farmer in this market.

Mr. MADDEN. We are a homogeneous people; we live on the same plane, we think alike, we talk alike, and our ambitions are alike, our hopes are alike, and I hope some day we will all be in one country and under one flag.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I was very much enlightened by the gentleman's statement that our population of 92,000,000 people might possibly be benefited to the extent of 5 cents a head as the effect of reciprocity. Now, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he thinks that it is worth while to assess the agricultural part of our population for the benefit of all the rest of our population in order to get the problematical 5 cents per head for the 92,000,000 people?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I think it is absurd to allow the products provided for in this bill to come into this country free—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not the gentleman affected somewhat by his city environment in relation to reciprocity?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all. I do not recognize the city as paramount to the country or the country as paramount to the

city. I believe we should legislate along broad lines and along lines which are patriotic.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I applauded the gentleman when he gave utterance to that sentiment, but he seemed to have slipped a cog on reciprocity.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. The gentleman's environment makes him ask these questions along narrow lines.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman's environment makes him answer this question along certain lines. I will not say "narrow lines."

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That is all right.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to include the papers which I asked previously to have read by the Clerk printed without being read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has general leave to do that.

The papers are as follows:

Alphabetical list of articles entering into the manufacture of boots and shoes and the import duty thereon.

Articles.	Rates of duty.
Blackings.....	25 per cent ad valorem.
Box toes, of sole leather cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Buttons, shoe:	
If made of paper, board, papier-mâché, pulp, or other similar material, valued at not exceeding 3 cents per gross.....	1 cent per gross.
If made of metal, horn, or glass.....	1 cent per line per gross and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Calfskins.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Counters.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Cement, rubber.....	20 per cent ad valorem.
Cordivan, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Duck.....	21 cents per square yard.
Dressing for shoes.....	25 per cent ad valorem.
Enamel and patent leather:	
If weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins.....	27 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
If weighing over 10 and not over 25 pounds per dozen skins.....	27 cents per pound and 8 per cent ad valorem.
If weighing over 25 pounds per dozen skins.....	20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Eyelets:	
Brass or steel.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Enameled.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Celluloid covered.....	65 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.
Flannel.....	31 cents per square yard.
Goring:	
If made of cotton, flax, or other vegetable fiber.....	60 per cent ad valorem.
If made of silk.....	60 per cent ad valorem.
Glue, if valued over 10 cents and not over 35 cents per pound.....	25 per cent ad valorem.
Horsehide, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Hemlock, sole leather.....	5 per cent ad valorem.
Heels, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Hooks.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Insoles, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kip, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kid, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kangaroo, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Lifting for heels, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Laces:	
If made of leather.....	50 cents per gross pairs and 10 per cent ad valorem.
If made of cotton or other vegetable fiber.....	25 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
If made of silk.....	50 per cent ad valorem.
Nails:	
Cut.....	1 cent per pound.
Hob.....	1 1/2 cents per pound.
Needles:	
Hand-sewing needles.....	Free.
Sewing-machine needles.....	\$1 per M and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Oak, sole leather.....	5 per cent ad valorem.
Oilecloth.....	3 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.
Outsoles, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Patent leather. See Enamel leather.	
Rands, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Rivets.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Side leather, upper leather.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Shanks:	
Of steel.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Of wood.....	35 per cent ad valorem.
Of leather board.....	40 per cent ad valorem.
Shellac, bleached or white, in rolls.....	1 cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Silk, for facings.....	50 per cent ad valorem.
Stays:	
Cloth, if made of flax or cotton.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Leather.....	40 per cent ad valorem.
Skivers, sheepskin leather:	
If raw.....	Free.
If tanned.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Sole thread, per sample.....	22 1/2 cents per pound.
Stain.....	30 per cent ad valorem.
Top pieces, of sole leather, cut in form.....	15 per cent ad valorem.
Twine.....	23 cents per square yard.
Twine.....	23 cents per pound.
Waxed tacks not exceeding 16 ounces per M.....	1 cent per M.

Alphabetical list of articles entering into the manufacture of boots and shoes and the import duty thereon—Continued.

Articles.	Rates of duty.
Cut tacks exceeding 16 ounces per M.....	1 cent per pound.
Wrought tacks.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Thread:	
Cotton, white and black, in skeins.....	1 cent per 100 yards.
Silk.....	\$1.50 per pound.
Union, sole leather.....	5 per cent ad valorem.
Velvet.....	47 1/2 per cent ad valorem.
Viscol, waterproof liquid.....	25 per cent ad valorem.
Wetling.....	25 per cent ad valorem.
Wax.....	20 per cent ad valorem.
Webbing:	
If made of cotton, flax, or other vegetable fiber.....	60 per cent ad valorem.
If containing wool.....	50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Wire:	
Brass.....	45 per cent ad valorem.
Steel.....	35 per cent ad valorem.

CAROLINA BAGGING CO.,
Henderson, N. C., April 24, 1911.

DEAR SIR: The farmers' free-list bill just introduced in Congress proposes to admit jute into this country free. We believe everyone should interest himself with his Congressman and Senator to prevent this part of the bill becoming a law. We ask you to do so. This product grows in India and nowhere else. Conditions there require payment by jute manufacturers of an average of about 50 cents per week to their laborers. This is very shocking, but it is taken from their Government report for the year 1909.

The duty on cotton bagging, which is made of jute, is about 30 cents per roll. With this small amount of protection manufacturers of bagging and other jute products have had a hard time to live for the last few years. Several factories have failed and gone out of business.

But there are now seven bagging factories in North Carolina, three in South Carolina, three in Virginia, and three in Georgia. Large amounts of capital are invested in these. Admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories and throw all their labor out of employment. Our factory employs 200 operators, who receive from \$4 to \$10 per week, on which they and their families live. The duty on our annual output of 100,000 rolls is about 30 cents per roll, or \$30,000. Take this from our earnings and we could not go on at all, and would close our factory. May God forbid such a result. We and our help all cry to Congress to forbid it.

Take another view of it. A few years ago there was much talk of using cotton for cotton bagging. At the present prices of cotton, of course, the farmers can not afford that.

But millions of yards of cotton bagging are used yearly for cement, grain, flour, beans, and other such purposes. If the duty on jute is removed the great and immediate inflow of the manufactured product would supply jute for all these and many other uses now supplied by cotton goods. We would thus in return for the pitiful sum of about 4 cents a bale duty now paid by the farmer on cotton bagging, have to be taxed in some other way to supply that loss of revenue to the Government, lose our factories to their owners, our wages to the laborers, and sustain a considerable reduction in the use and price of cotton. Thus the prophecy of Bret Harte will be fulfilled: "We are ruined by Chinese cheap labor." We pray you, dear sir, to aid in averting such a calamity. Aid by writing your Representative to vote against free jute. Aid by asking your neighbor to do so. And pray with us that such a calamity may be averted.

We write not as Democrats or Republicans, but as business men who protest against being prevented from making a living for ourselves and those working with us for the same purpose.

Yours, very truly,

CAROLINA BAGGING CO.,
S. S. PARIHAM, Vice President.

CHICAGO, April 17, 1911.

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARTIN: I am somewhat concerned about the bill introduced by Congressman UNDERWOOD placing a number of items on the free list. If there is, in your opinion, any chance of the passage of this bill, I request that you advise me of it promptly, so that the shoe manufacturers may have a chance to make the fight of their lives to prevent the removal of the duty on shoes.

While we are not in possession of complete information about the cost of producing shoes in Germany, Austria, England, and other European countries, yet we believe we know enough to warrant the claim that we can not compete with the cheap labor of those countries. Only recently it has been developed by English investigators that American wages are, on the average, two and one-fourth times as high as English. While the United States has led the world in the style and appearance of its footwear, and has been able to export shoes to some countries on this account, nevertheless this exportation has been chiefly in the higher grades, the shoes worn by the better classes, who are willing to pay for style and appearance. In the cheaper grades we have been entirely unable to compete with any of those countries; as a matter of fact, cheap English shoes have been brought into this country since the duty was lowered under the Payne-Aldrich bill.

The European countries, especially Germany, are importing our lasts, patterns, and shoe machinery where it is superior to their own and sending young men over here to learn the American system of shoe manufacturing. It is only fair to assume that with their splendid industrial equipment they will soon invade this market.

We shoe manufacturers probably should not object to free shoes, provided this country went on a free-trade basis, so that wages throughout all the industries could be adjusted to the changed conditions. However, to remove the duty on one article like shoes and leave it on other articles would prevent us from lowering our wages to the foreign level, for if we did it we would lose our help, and therefore there is only the other alternative, that we should lose our business to the foreigners. If we had all of our raw materials free and free shoe machinery, so that we could get the cheapest materials and the cheapest and best machinery to manufacture our product, we might stand a chance, but with duties on the raw materials that we use ranging from 5 to almost 50

per cent and an entirely prohibitive duty on shoe machinery we are handicapped too heavily to hold our business if shoes are admitted free.

Another thing that should be investigated before the duty is removed on shoes is the shoe-machinery trust and the difference between the terms it makes in this country and in foreign countries, where it has some effective competition. In this country it has none, and the shoe manufacturers have no choice but to use its machinery on its own terms.

Yours, very truly,

SELZ, SCHWAB & Co.,
J. HARRY SELZ,
Second Vice President.

SPRATT'S PATENT (AMERICA) (LTD.),
Newark, N. J., April 18, 1911.

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your attention is earnestly and respectfully requested:

We are manufacturers of dog cakes and other biscuits and foods for domestic animals generally, but our chief business is dog cakes. If our reading of bill H. R. 4413 is correct, it would, if passed, allow these foods to come into the United States free of duty.

We in this State, and similar industries in other States, have laboriously, and at first with great loss, built up a business under the protection of a 20 per cent tariff. It has been barely enough. We alone have invested some hundreds of thousands of dollars in an expensive plant and in the purchase of patent rights from an English company. We have felt reasonably sure of a continuous moderate protection, and, at least, that it would not be suddenly withdrawn.

If this measure becomes law, it will be disastrous to us and to a considerable number of wage earners. No class in the United States deals with us less than the farmer. To put dog biscuits on the free list would scarcely benefit him.

Very respectfully,

SPRATT'S PATENT (LTD.).

CHICAGO, ILL., April 27, 1911.

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Foreign shoe manufacturers have free material, pay no royalty on machinery, and get labor at about half paid in this country. How can we Illinois manufacturers and wholesalers of shoes compete under these conditions if shoes are admitted free? Tariff on shoes is only 10 per cent; on all other wearing apparel averages 60 per cent. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? We earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions.

Selz, Schwab & Co.; J. P. Smith Shoe Co.; Florsheim Shoe Co.; Smith-Wallace Shoe Co.; Guthman Carpenter & Telling; Watson Plummer Shoe Co.; J. E. Tilt Shoe Co.; H. F. C. Dovenmuehle & Son; Fargo & Phelps; A. A. Putnam & Son; The Rice & Hutchinson Chicago Shoe Co.; R. P. Smith & Sons Co.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats are trying to play politics. They are not trying to give the American any advantage. They talk about a reduction of the cost of living that will result from the enactment of this bill into law, but nobody will claim that you can reduce the cost of living without reducing the standard of living, unless you reduce the wage scale, and when you do that you reduce the standard of living, because you reduce the power to buy; and when you reduce the power to buy you necessarily compel the man who buys to live on a lower grade. God forbid that the American laborer will ever be compelled to face the awful conditions which confront the foreign laborer, and which he will be compelled to face if the Democratic Party succeeds in its desire to open the doors of the United States to the markets of free-trade Europe. If that ever happens—and happen it will if the Democrats have their way about it—a condition of distress and poverty will confront us such as I hope I may never live to see.

I have read with much interest in a book recently published by Samuel Gompers something of the conditions that confront the laboring man in England, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland.

Mr. Gompers says that—

Twenty-two thousand dock laborers report in Liverpool at the gates alongshore every day seeking a job, and, on the average, only 15,000 find employment.

He refers feelingly to the degree of poverty written on the faces of this great army of unemployed. He refers to the physical weakness of the men in the crowd, and declares them to be the smallest people in stature he had ever seen in an English community. He says that the deepest impression made upon his mind in England came from its poverty—that poverty and misery are everywhere in England, and that the reason for wan faces, tattered clothing, and unshod feet is to be found in the number of the constantly unemployed. The sights made such an impression upon Mr. Gompers that he sees from time to time since—

Those numbers of demoralized, degraded objects which ought to be men and women have formed in my mind's eye a procession moving along together past me, mournful, hopeless, repellent, a disgrace to our boasted civilization.

Mr. Gompers says that in Holland and Belgium a degree of poverty exists such as hardly can be conceived by a dweller in an American city.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. I only have about two minutes left.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that in the harvest time in Canada, when they are badly in need of labor, the British Government sends over to Canada on special vessels and sends through Canada on special trains this very product of the great cities of Liverpool, London, and Manchester which you are describing now?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, is it not true that this phase of humanity which Mr. Gompers so luridly and so truthfully describes is the kind of labor which in the harvest time in Canada comes in contact with Canadian labor and with the American labor that we send across the border—with the school-boys and the farm boys of the United States who go over there to do work in their fields?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not say. I am not familiar with the situation, and of course I would not undertake to speak without knowledge.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say, then, that I was in Canada when a trainload came into the Alberta and Saskatchewan country, which has been so much discussed in this debate.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman not know that this class of labor which is described in England, Belgium, and other European countries is the same class of labor that comes to this country in million lots annually in competition with American labor? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. The difference between conditions in this country and conditions abroad are that when men come to this country they are employed in accordance with the American standard of wages and they live in accordance with the American standards of living. [Applause on the Republican side.] Either we or our forefathers came to this country from abroad, and if it were not for the fact that our forefathers were permitted to come here we would not have the opportunity of sitting here and legislating for the American people to-day.

And I am glad to see the opportunity afforded the people of downtrodden Europe to be admitted to the shores of this free land, where every man has an opportunity to rise and where opportunity is the one thing in which we glory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I began work carrying water at 50 cents a day in the institution of which I am now the head. Does anybody suppose that a boy beginning to carry water at 50 cents a day in any institution in any country in Europe would ever rise to a place where he would have a right to vote upon legislation for 90,000,000 people? No! I say, give them an opportunity to come. Treat them right when they come. Pay them the best wages that can be paid. Give them the best opportunity to live as human beings should live. The glory of this country is that we afford every man who comes to our shores that opportunity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is not this the same class of people that are to-day being employed in the great steel plants of our country for from 12 to 13 hours per day at the miserable pittance of 12½ cents an hour?

Mr. MADDEN. If that is true, the steel people ought to be brought to account for it, and I am ashamed if we have such an institution in this country. But I do not think that is so. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman believe that the American workingman should have to come in contact and into competition with this class of labor?

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I have been a large employer of labor, and my experience is that the first generation of foreign labor that comes here educates its children in the public schools of America, where they are taught to love our institutions, and among the second generation comes the best citizens in the land. Sometimes we may have to submit to the competition, which affords the opportunity to bring men up to the standard which the second generation reaches, and I hope that we will continue to hold out the right hand of fellowship to the downtrodden people of the world and give them

the opportunity to become men in a free land and under a free flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We have extended the right hand of fellowship to the down-trodden of all the world, welcomed them to our shores, clothed them with the dignity of citizenship, enabled them to enjoy the blessings of liberty, opened our public schools to their children, taught them to love our institutions, and encouraged them to assimilate with our people. The result is that we have developed a Nation of patriotic and liberty-loving people, through whose veins course the blood of all the nations, but whose every impulse is strictly American. We have thus proved to the world that under the beneficent influence of Republican policies we have been able to make men as well as merchandise. These deeds of the Republican Party in the interest of humanity, written on the pages of the Nation's history, will be handed down to a grateful posterity and applauded by the generations yet to come as the acme of devotion to the welfare of our common country.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to Senate Document 521, a report of the Bureau of Labor, of the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works, where he will find that thousands of these foreign workmen are employed from 12 to 13 hours a day at 12½ cents an hour in competition with the American workmen. I will refer the gentleman also to the Pittsburgh Survey, where he will find the same condition exists in the great iron and steel industries in the neighborhood of Pittsburgh, Pa. And I would like to say to the gentleman that in Pennsylvania 62 per cent of those engaged in bituminous coal mining are of foreign-speaking nationalities, and 51 per cent of those engaged in anthracite coal mining are of foreign-speaking nationalities, and the result is that the producers of bituminous coal in some parts of Pennsylvania are the lowest paid miners of any coal produced anywhere in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for 10 minutes more time.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania going to vote for this so-called farmers' free-list bill?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I am.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to do the very thing against which he argues. He is going to place the American workman on the basis of European starvation wages by giving an opportunity to the European manufacturers to send their products into this country free and shut out the American workman from the opportunity of earning American wages here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When I was talking about this labor proposition, about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilson] interrupted me, I was quoting Mr. Gompers, the leader of the American Federation of Labor. I was not making the statement. Mr. Gompers was making the statement, and I believe he was stating the truth.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked the question whether there had not been a large number of undesirable persons brought in from the European countries to the United States to work in American mills. We concede that there have been a large number of these undesirable immigrants. But I want to ask the gentleman whether there was not a time when both this undesirable and the desirable labor left the United States because it could not procure work, and because conditions here were more appalling than those described in Europe by Mr. Gompers, and whether that time was not under the late Democratic administration?

Mr. MADDEN. There never was a Democratic administration in power for any length of time that the emigration was not about as much going from this country the other way as was the immigration coming this way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Gompers says that agricultural laborers in the eastern central part of England receive compensation at the rate of \$2.88 per week; motor car drivers receive, after paying for their gasoline, something like 2 shillings for 15 hours' work. In London the union scale for men in the binding department in printing offices is 34 shillings for 54 hours; for cutters, 30 shillings; for girl folders, 15 shillings. In Berlin saddlers earn from \$6.50 to \$7 per week. In Hungary the pay for skilled

millers is less than 80 cents a day. The best-paid workmen in Budapest are bricklayers; they receive from \$1 to \$1.20 per day. This fabulous price, however, is paid only in the summer time. In winter they receive 60 cents a day for unskilled work.

I have wondered if, while looking upon the poverty stricken laboring men and women of free-trade Europe, Mr. Gompers did not frequently thank God that he was an American citizen and represented an organization in this country where under a wise and beneficent Constitution they do not have to tolerate parties which by unwise legislation can bring about such distressing conditions.

The laboring man who remembers the doleful years from 1893 to 1897 will not look with favor upon the pending bill, Mr. Chairman. Conditions in this country became almost as distressing to the laboring men during that gloomy period as those existing to-day in free-trade Europe, so graphically described by Mr. Gompers in his book I have just referred to.

The hum of the wheels in the factories and the rumbling of the machinery in the mills will never become odious to those men, nor will the smell of the smoke of commercial activity make them wish for a repetition of a like period of idleness.

The American laboring man knows he is the best paid, the best housed, the best clad, and the most contented wage earner on the face of the earth. He knows that he receives from two to five times as much for his hire as is received by any like person in this broad universe. He wants to continue to receive such compensation, but he knows—and no Democratic politician can make him understand otherwise—that the adoption of this bill into law will not better his condition, but will, in fact, bring back those days of '93 to '97 which were a curse to American manhood and American womanhood.

Tariff-for-revenue bills—I refer to general tariff-for-revenue bills—have always caused our country to suffer commercial paralysis. What will a free trade measure like the pending bill do to us? There never was a time, however, following the adoption of a Republican protective tariff measure that the country did not, under its stimulating and invigorating effect, take on new and increased activity.

The way to keep America prosperous is not by passing free-trade legislation and by opening our markets to European products. You can not employ European factories to make goods for American consumption without throwing American workmen out of employment. That is exactly what you are trying to do now. What advantage is there in being able to buy foreign-made goods cheap if to do so we are first compelled to shut off the forge and the loom? What would it profit us to have Europe take our market while we are looking for theirs? Do you want to give up the home market and take a chance on the foreign market? If so, pass this bill. I do not want to give up the home market and am therefore opposed to this bill and shall vote against it when the roll is called upon its passage, and I hope that in the other legislative branch of this country a halt will be called upon the enactment of this infamous, nefarious humbug into a law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gillett].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself to one item in this bill, the item of cotton bagging. It is hardly necessary for me to suggest that my special interest in this one item is because it is manufactured in my district. We have there a prosperous factory, and I can see absolutely no reason and no excuse for putting cotton bagging on the free list, except the desire that the cotton planter of the South may buy the covering for his bale a little cheaper; and to accomplish that you are willing to take away the manufacture from operatives in the United States and transfer it to the underfed, undereducated, underclothed, underpaid natives of India. That must be the result; that must be the purpose of this clause of the bill. From a protective standpoint it is indefensible, from a tariff-for-revenue standpoint it is indefensible, from an American standpoint it is indefensible. Its only defense is a narrow sectional class advantage.

I believe the policy is as shortsighted as it is unfair. It is shortsighted because if we once drive the manufacture out of the United States, drive it to India entirely, extinguish it here, then, of course, the Indian manufacturer will have absolute control of the market, and it is not very probable that his prices will be made with any special regard to the feelings of the cotton planter of the South; they will have a monopoly and will not fail to use it; so I believe, even from your own interest, it is not wise.

But I suppose you have got to show that the Democratic Party is in power. You have got to show your gratitude for the votes of the South; you have got to cater to that section and do some-

thing to show that the South is in the saddle and the Democratic Party is caring for its own, and so you are striking off cotton bagging from the protected list. I think I can show that there is no fair argument why we ought not to give the present rate of duty to this article.

What are the facts? It was about 40 years ago that the manufacture of this article commenced in the United States. I think the first mill that started was the Ludlow Manufacturing Co., in my district.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that cotton bagging is controlled by a trust?

Mr. GILLETT. It is not; I will come to that later.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that it is manufactured practically by one concern?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Where is it made?

Mr. GILLETT. It is made in a half a dozen different places. I will come to that, and after I get through the gentleman can ask me more about it if he wishes.

When we began 40 years ago all cotton bagging was imported and sold for 35 cents per yard. We at once cut the price to 18 cents and have sold it as low as 5 cents. Inasmuch as it only takes about 6 yards of bagging to cover a bale of cotton, duty on that 6 yards would be between 3 and 4 cents. A bale of cotton is worth \$60 or \$70. So that simply to save—even if the whole duty was added to the price—simply to save 3 or 4 cents for the cotton planter on each bale, you are going to strike down an industry that is scattered over the United States and has been established by a determined policy.

Now, where is it that the imported bagging is made? Where is our main competition? It used to be in Dundee, Scotland, but by the tariff that was put on cotton bagging the American manufacturers were able to compete with Dundee, and we would be willing to compete with England, even with the present low duty, although all our machinery has to be imported from England, because there is none made in the United States, and we have to pay a 45 per cent duty on that machinery. Yet, with that imported machinery and with the tax that we pay on it, and with the duty on cotton bagging less than 10 per cent ad valorem, we are willing to compete with the manufacturers of England.

But unfortunately the Scotland manufacturers, when they could not compete successfully with us, moved their machinery and their foremen and their business to Calcutta, and there, on the banks of the Hoogly River, where the jute grows and is brought right into their mills, they have the same machinery that we have here, paying no duty on it, and instead of the labor that we have here they have Indian labor, for which they pay about 50 cents per week.

Now, let me read from the United States Consular and Trade Report of 1907, showing what the competition is that we have to meet, against what class of labor it is that you are unwilling to protect us by a duty of even 10 per cent.

Let me read you from United States Consular and Trade Report No. 2897, 1907:

The wages paid to men in the mills range from \$2 to \$3 per month, women from \$1.50 to \$2, and boys and girls from \$1 to \$1.75. These people subsist principally on rice and vegetables made up in the form of curry, which is a peppery and sweetish mixture of rice and vegetables, with now and then chicken, duck, or goat meat.

They all chew betel nut constantly as a stimulant. They eat two meals a day as a rule, one before beginning work and one after the day's work is done. The men and boys wear breechclouts, or dhoties, and the women and girls saris, which consists of 40 yards of thin muslin wrapped in a peculiar way about the loins and shoulders.

The people of a mill, or several mills if the mills are nearly located together, occupy a village, which is made up of huts made of mud, bricks, and palm leaves woven into sheets and tacked onto bamboo poles. All are thatched with a long, tough grass used throughout India for covering huts and bungalows, and which makes a tight, cool, and durable roof. The floor is made of clay tamped down hard, which makes a very good floor. On this floor is spread in places matting made of bamboo grass. On this matting many of the natives throw down a cotton blanket, or possibly a thin mattress, for beds.

Some have a rude bed made of four posts 16 inches high, with cross-head and sidepieces pinned together, and then crisscrossed with bed-cords. There may be a few rude benches, but little or no furniture is to be seen in the huts. The natives eat on the floor, squatted around a pot or pan containing the food. The men and boys eat first and the women and girls afterwards, taking what is left. The mode of life is thoroughly primitive. No knives, spoons, or forks are used in eating, the fingers answering all purposes.

Now, those are the persons that are manufacturing the cotton bagging in competition with that made in the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I remember reading in the consular report that same account, and it is said they begin to work at 6 o'clock

in the morning, take one-half an hour for noon, and work 14 hours a day, and that there was an attempt then being made to cut the day down to 12 hours; and they were working for \$2.50 and \$3 a month, 14 hours a day.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes. Here, of course, in the United States—in Massachusetts at least—they are limited to 55 hours of work a week. As the gentleman said, they work 14 hours a day and at wages about one-tenth of what we pay.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, does that report show what the unit of value of each one of these men is?

Mr. GILLETT. No; this report does not show that; but I read an English report which did show it, and my recollection is that they thought the unit of work was about one-third. The gentleman will recognize that this is about the simplest, the lowest form of work in manufacture, that there can be. It requires very slight intelligence and requires only manual dexterity. The operators of India, therefore, are better able to compete with us in this than they would be in almost any other manufacture.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman before he gets through, and I would like to have him tell us, why it was that this combination that is commonly called the Bagging Trust was trying to keep out goods that were coming in competition with it and had them classified here at the rate of 45 per cent instead of the ordinary rate on cotton bagging.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know where the gentleman gets his facts. I presume he gets them from the same circular that was sent to me. I dispute those facts. They say that this Bagging Trust has done so and so. Why, there is no trust at all, as I shall show later.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that a decision was made that even though they did have it classified, and they did bring the goods in, and they did claim they wanted to pay a higher rate than was necessary, yet they had a right to pay an even higher rate, if they desired, if the classification was correctly higher?

Mr. GILLETT. No; it is not a fact. This is what I am told. They brought in some bagging which was not made of jute, but of certain grasses, and not being classified as jute they were classified under the general class where they ought to go.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Did not the Bagging Trust have to appeal this—

Mr. GILLETT. There is no Bagging Trust.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Well, the persons bringing that in, did they not have to appeal in order to get themselves assessed higher?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about that, but I do not see what difference it makes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then the gentleman did not read the circular.

Mr. GILLETT. If the gentleman thinks this bagging made out of these grasses ought to be brought in at the same rate of duty as the jute bagging instead of 45 per cent, which is the unclassified rate, let his party say it shall come in at the same rate as jute, at 10 per cent. I have no objection to that; but that is not jute bagging. They try to bring it in as jute instead of grass, and so naturally those that were competing with it tried to make it pay the highest price they could.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman deny that that was a fabricated case—

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know.

Mr. BURLESON (continuing). And that those behind it were the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Co.?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about it. Yes, I do; I deny it was the Ludlow Co.; I know it was not.

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman know that there was a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee in the tariff hearings of 1909 showing that the sale of the output of bagging made in the United States was divided between the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. upon the basis of 82 per cent to the American Manufacturing Co. and 18 per cent to the Ludlow Co., and that that arrangement had been in existence for years?

Mr. GILLETT. A great deal of testimony may have been presented; I do not know whether it was or not; but I deny it was true, if it was.

Mr. BURLESON. Upon what authority does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. GILLETT. Upon the authority of the Ludlow Co.

Mr. BURLESON. They were before the committee. Why did not they themselves deny it? Why should the gentleman

come now and deny something that the Ludlow Co. did not then deny?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know whether they denied it or not, but—

Mr. BURLESON. I invite the gentleman to an inspection of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means and challenge him to point out to this committee any testimony from the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. wherein a denial was made that this agreement existed.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not even know they were before the committee, but I venture to say you will not find anything where they admitted it was true, because they told me it was not so.

Mr. BURLESON. No; of course they would not admit it, because it is a violation of the law.

Mr. GILLETT. They denied it, undoubtedly.

Mr. BURLESON. They failed to deny it.

Mr. GILLETT. I read the testimony at the time, I remember, but I do not remember anything about it. Now that we are on that subject, I will say this: You talk about trusts and have doubtless received circulars, as I have, from men who are engaged in the business of importing this foreign bagging, and consequently are interested to drive the American manufacturer, their rival, out of the business. I have received circulars, and they claim there is a trust. There is no evidence of it, and I have a statement from the president of my company, a man in whose integrity I have absolute confidence, who tells me that there has not been, either directly or indirectly, any combination of the Ludlow Co. with any other manufacturers in the United States. Why, you talk about a trust when 20 per cent of the cotton bagging that is used in the United States is imported now and has been for many years. The tariff is a little less than 10 per cent ad valorem and has been for years. Is that an exorbitant duty, is that an extravagant duty, to keep out foreign manufacturers and particularly the manufacturers employing such labor as that to which I have alluded? No; it seems to me that fact in and of itself proves that the tariff is not high enough to allow any monopoly in this country. I notice the Committee on Ways and Means states in their report that we give free binding twine to the western farmer, and therefore why should we not give free cotton bagging to the southern farmer. That argument and the imaginary trust are the only excuses offered. You know that is not a fair analogy.

When binding twine was put on the free list there had not been any importations of binding twine for years. It was apparent that the tariff was prohibitory, and it was put on the free list. What was the result? Still there were no importations of binding twine. Apparently there was not any made that could compete with us, even without a duty, and from that day to within a very few years ago there was no competition on binding twine, and it could well afford to have that duty taken off.

Recently there has been a little importation, and from whom? Has it come from countries like India, where labor is employed at 50 cents a week? Why, no. The only place that binding twine has been imported from in any amount was from the only nation that I think we do not need to have any protective tariff against—from Canada. And it was produced there, I presume, simply because the agricultural-implement industry moved over there from the United States, and in that connection they made binding twine and sometimes dumped their surplus into the United States. So I claim that that has no analogy at all. It differs from this in the fact that when that was put on there was no importation of binding twine, whereas now in cotton bagging there is an annual importation of 20 per cent of all that is used, and the only nation that ever has made binding twine in competition is a nation where the standards of labor and living are almost like those in the United States, and not, as in the case of cotton bagging, so low and inferior that no one will pretend that there can be equal competition between us.

So, I say, I am assured by the president of this company that it has never been in any combination, that the price has not been fixed between them, and that they have entirely different agents. It seems to be the policy of my friends on the other side, inasmuch as they are short of other arguments, to accuse this company of being a trust. I remember when I was in the law school I was told if I had not any case, to pitch into the lawyer on the other side. And just as in different eras of the world, it has been the practice, if you wanted to hurt your enemy, to call him a Christian, or a Jew, or a witch, or heretic, so the demagogue to-day denounces every opponent as the friend of trusts and monopolies. I would like to see some evidence that this is a trust. The president of this company, which manufactures, I think, about 20 per cent of the cotton manufactured in the United States, a man interested, of course,

but in whose integrity I have implicit confidence, assures me that there is no combination in prices or sales, and the fact that about 20 per cent of all that is used is imported from India is itself proof that there is no monopoly. How much must be imported to satisfy you that there is no monopoly? Apparently you want 100 per cent.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman prepared to state what proportion or per cent of the cotton bagging used in the United States is produced here, and what per cent is imported?

Mr. GILLETT. I say about 20 per cent is imported from India, and consequently 80 per cent of it is produced here. Some of it is produced in Ludlow; there is a large mill in Brooklyn, N. Y., and there are mills in many other States. I suppose that what originally started this talk of a trust was that a good many years ago there was apparently an attempt made to make a consolidation of all the bagging manufactories.

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman know that certain bagging mills in the South were bought by the American Manufacturing Co., dismantled and closed, and stockholders in these local concerns received as their purchase price stock of the American Manufacturing Co., and has not that condition continued ever since?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what I was going on to say. I understand there was an attempt years ago to make a large combination. A good many mills were bought out and they were formed under the title you mentioned, of the American Manufacturing Co., into one large concern, and that absorbed a number of mills. Some of them were dismantled and some kept on. But they did not absorb all; they did not acquire a monopoly.

Mr. BURLESON. I will admit that they did not absorb the Ludlow concern. But I want to know if—because all we want to know is the truth—the gentleman denies that the Ludlow concern manufactures more than 18 per cent of the American product?

Mr. GILLETT. I deny the manufacture in any specific per cent; indeed, I do.

Mr. BURLESON. You say you have no knowledge of their understanding with the American Manufacturing Co. of Brooklyn? Do you deny that through a series of years the Ludlow Co. manufactured about 18 per cent of the product that is supplied of the American product and never more?

Mr. GILLETT. The mill makes, I think, about 20 per cent. Probably the mill in Peru, Ind., is capable of making some certain per cent, and it is not always exactly the same per cent. There are at least these three different independent concerns that are now manufacturing.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman say that the Peru concern is entirely independent of the American Manufacturing Co.?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so. There is one other that is independent, and I think it is this Peru one. But if the gentleman means to intimate that they prescribe a certain percentage to each concern, I do deny it.

Mr. BURLESON. I call the attention of the gentleman to the emphatic statement made by a former employee of the American Manufacturing Co. before the Committee on Ways and Means, tariff hearings, in 1909. The gentleman can only have his information at second hand.

Mr. GILLETT. I have it at first hand from a gentleman who is in a position to know.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman must know that such testimony is only hearsay. Mr. Ludlow has not come here or before the committee to say so.

Mr. GILLETT. There never was any Mr. Ludlow, so far as I know.

Mr. BURLESON. Whoever the proprietor is, or the general manager, or some one having first-hand knowledge of the fact.

Mr. GILLETT. Whether this former employee that the gentleman refers to is a man of integrity or not I do not know. The gentleman apparently is depending upon the word of a former employee to lay a foundation for the charge of a trust, which is emphatically denied by one man, at least, who does know. And, as I say, it is very easy for the gentleman from Texas to cry "trust" and to try to make out that there is a wicked combination, in order to make unpopular the persons who are manufacturing the bagging which he wants to be able to buy cheaper. He wants it all imported. He wants it to be made in India, does he?

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman speak from hearsay? Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman answer my question first? [Laughter.]

Mr. BURLESON. I want to see the southern producer who raises cotton relieved of the tribute exacted of him and which he has been paying for so many years.

Mr. GILLET. What tribute?

Mr. BURLESON. The tribute he pays to this Bagging Trust or combination.

Mr. GILLET. Three-fourths of a cent tariff?

Mr. BURLESON. Now, under the fabricated case and decision of the customs appraisers, it is proposed to make it 45 per cent.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman is mistaken. That applies to grass, not to the jute bagging.

Mr. BURLESON. It is sought to be made to apply to the bagging imported for use in the coming cotton crop. I would like to ask the gentleman how many people are employed in the Ludlow mill in making cotton bagging, not in making cordage and other products?

Mr. GILLET. About 600.

Now, apparently the only claim they can make is that this manufacture is controlled by a trust; and yet, as I say, the most complete answer to that is that the tariff is now so low that 20 per cent is imported, so that there can be no monopoly. Apparently the gentleman wants to see the whole 100 per cent imported. If 20 per cent is not enough to make competition, to prevent a trust from having a monopoly, how much does the gentleman want to see imported? If a tariff of less than 10 per cent against the coolie employees of India is too much, then I agree that you might as well have nothing. If you strike out this, it simply drives the business, the manufacture, from the United States to India; and that, apparently, is the intention of the Democratic Party. They apparently want to drive these employees in Ludlow and in Brooklyn and in Indiana into some other employment.

Mr. AUSTIN. And there are also establishments in North Carolina and Georgia and Tennessee.

Mr. GILLET. Yes; in many other States, as the gentleman says. American mills will have this machinery, which was imported, paying a high duty, made useless and turned into worthless junk in order that the cotton planter may save about 3 cents on each bale of cotton that is worth \$60 or \$70 a bale.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman said that a bale of cotton is worth from \$65 to \$70 and the bagging worth only 3 cents?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. My recollection is that the recent value of a bale of cotton has been \$80 or \$90 a bale, whereas under the Democratic administration some years ago it was worth only \$23 or \$24 a bale. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma claim that any tariff on cotton fixed under the Payne-Aldrich bill is the cause of the present high price of cotton?

Mr. GILLET. I should say it would be even a little more ridiculous now to try to save 3 cents on a bale than it was when a bale of cotton was worth only \$20.

Mr. BURLESON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma again whether he thinks the present high price of cotton is caused by the existing tariff law?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I am making no claim. I am simply stating the facts as to what the conditions were under the Democratic administration as compared with what the conditions were under a Republican administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURLESON. But answer. Is it caused by the tariff?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. There is no doubt but that the high price was made possible by the policy of the Republican Party when it was in power and that the depression referred to was caused by the policy of the Democratic Party when it was in power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. I am sorry I can not let you have a discussion with the gentleman from Oklahoma in my time.

Mr. SIMS. Does not the gentleman know that the price of cotton was lower in 1898 than at any prior time?

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the Wilson bill was the tariff on cotton bagging taken off?

Mr. GILLET. It was.

Mr. ESCH. And, if so, what effect had it upon the industry at that time?

Mr. GILLET. We had, as I remember, under the McKinley bill practically the whole market to ourselves, and when the duty was taken off in the Wilson bill the importations immediately leaped up from practically nothing to 16,000,000 yards the last year, and then the Dingley bill again put on this small duty.

Mr. ESCH. That was a much smaller duty than the former duty under the McKinley bill?

Mr. GILLET. Oh, yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Right in that connection, Mr. Pierce, who represented the district from St. Louis, came before the Dingley Ways and Means Committee. He was a manufacturer of cotton bagging, and he had been on a tour round the world for two or three years and had examined the conditions in every mill in Egypt, and had also been to Dundee and examined the conditions there; and when he got through he explained the matter to the committee and stated the facts that he had ascertained, and suggested this very low duty. Some of the other manufacturers thought it was not enough to put the business again on its feet. He said he wanted as low a duty as he could get and still do the business or do a portion of it; and that is the reason that that very low duty was made in the Dingley bill. I forget what the former duty was under the McKinley bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The duty on these articles was fixed in accordance with the Republican platform, was it not, in the Payne bill?

Mr. GILLET. I do not know whether it was or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the presumption—that the duties in the Payne bill were fixed in accordance with the Republican platform.

Mr. GILLET. I think this was a good deal less. This is the most extreme case you could get.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The theory upon which the Payne bill was framed was the declaration in the Republican platform that the duty ought to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and afford a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. Now, was this duty fixed in accordance with the Republican platform, or was the promise of the Republican platform repudiated in this case?

Mr. GILLET. Neither one. I do not suppose the gentleman imagines that every schedule in the bill is exactly and accurately matched to that platform. I think myself that this is too low to give an adequate protection against the coolie labor of India.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to ask the gentleman if he can tell the wages that are paid in the mills in his district which manufacture this cotton bagging.

Mr. GILLET. As I remember the wages of the 600 men, women, and children who are engaged in this industry average about \$11 a week.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Ten dollars is the maximum wage paid in Brooklyn, except for machinists; and what I wanted to know was whether, in the opinion of the gentleman, \$10 a week is a living wage under a Republican tariff in any industry, when the tariff is fixed in accordance with the Republican platform.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 10 minutes more.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, as I say, I think that this is too low to accord with that principle. It is one of the lowest duties in the tariff, and that is one of the strong arguments against its repeal. It is only about 10 per cent, or a little less, ad valorem, and yet the gentlemen on that side say that 10 per cent is too high against this oriental labor. Now, if the gentleman had been here before, he would have heard me say that this is an exceedingly simple and easily learned kind of labor. It is about the crudest labor that there is. Women and children are employed in it. I agree that \$10 a week is very low.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Ten dollars is the wages paid to the men. The women and children get lower wages.

Mr. GILLET. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The women get \$6.15, and the children get various sums.

Mr. GILLET. I think the wages of the whole number average \$10 a week.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; that can not be, because outside of foremen, assistant foremen, and machinists—

Mr. GILLET. I included them in the average.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Machinists get \$21 a week and assistant foremen \$14.50.

Mr. GILLET. They are a part of the employment. They bring up the average.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but you might include the compensation of the officials of the corporations.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. When you are getting an average, you include both the high paid and the low paid.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The maximum salary or compensation paid a man is \$10 a week. Can the gentleman state how many hours a day the employees in these mills work?

Mr. GILLET. They work 55 hours a week—that is the limit—whereas over there they work 15 hours a day. If the gentleman's complaint is that these wages are too low, is that a reason for their doing away with the duty? Is that a reason for taking off the duty and sending the manufacture out of the country?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's inference is hardly correct. We will discuss that when we come to the profits that have been made by those engaged in the work.

Mr. GILLET. We can not tell what the profits are, for they have other branches of manufacture.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will put in the RECORD, if I can get it, the information which the Secretary of the Treasury has in hand under the corporation-tax act.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman can, of course, put in the RECORD what he pleases.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Secretary does not wish to give it to me, of course I can not put it in.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman not know that many of the employees in the constituent plants of the so-called Cotton Bag Trust are paid the miserable pittance of 60 cents a day?

Mr. GILLET. I do not know; it may be so. It is the simplest and crudest and lowest form of labor that there is. It is obliged to compete with Indian labor, and doubtless the employers get the cheapest labor they can, and now you gentlemen want to wipe away the tariff of 10 per cent under which they are just able to live. If the gentleman is correct, we employ the cheapest labor there is, and now the gentleman wants to wipe that off and drive it into some other employment.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will pardon me, can the gentleman tell us what is the labor cost compared to the total cost of production?

Mr. GILLET. I can not tell the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, I claim that this stands as a very clear case of an industry which has the lowest protection under which it can exist—less than 10 per cent ad valorem protection, one of the lowest in the whole list. Its competitor is the cheap labor of India, labor to whose standard no one wants us to descend, but what the gentlemen on the other side of the House are trying to do apparently is to drive out this industry from the United States. They want us to wind up our factories and send the work to India. I hope it is not a fair specimen of the spirit which animates the Democratic Party. You want us to abandon the American manufacture, you want to throw out of work the American laborer, and you want it done in order that you may save the magnificent sum of 3 cents a bale on cotton.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. I will.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that under this splendid system of protection of the Republican administration the employers now employ labor wherever they can get it cheapest; and is it not a fact that they are bringing about a million of foreign pauper laborers into this country every year to compete with American labor?

Mr. GILLET. That is not a very pertinent question to this matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it is. The gentleman said he wanted to protect the American workman against foreign competition.

Mr. GILLET. Does the gentleman from Illinois want to keep out foreign labor; is that his argument?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not making any argument at all.

Mr. GILLET. That seemed to be the result of the gentleman's question, and I want to find out what he is driving at.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts answer the question I asked?

Mr. GILLET. I first want to find out what the gentleman from Illinois is driving at.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the foreign workman would come here of his own volition under a condition where he could exercise his freedom with the American workman, I would say let the foreigner come in, but I do object to the working people of this

country being misled by the statement that they are protected by the tariff, when, in fact, there is no protection against the foreign workman at all; they have to compete with the foreign workman.

Mr. GILLET. Of course they do, and the gentleman's argument would seem to be that they ought not to. But what we are using here in competition with the ridiculously cheap labor of India is the cheapest labor that can be procured in this country.

It seems to me there is no tariff in our whole law which presents a stronger case than cotton bagging. The duty is low—less than 10 per cent. The foreign competition is not labor of the same class, but Orientals whose wages are only a tenth of ours and whose standards of living are as different. The present tariff is not high enough to allow a monopoly, as is proved by the fact that there has been for years an increasing importation, amounting to 20 per cent of the consumption. It is now a revenue duty, and in abolishing it you are losing revenue.

You Democrats have the power, and for the sake of the cotton planters you may strike down this American industry, turn some thousands of American operatives out of work, and hand it over to the Indian coolies; but you are demonstrating your true attitude toward labor, are showing who your real masters are, and are revealing the political principles which have so long kept you from power and which will again turn you out of power.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk to have read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on yesterday, a newspaper owned and controlled, as I understand, by the Hon. John R. McLean, one of the Democratic leaders and also the proprietor of the Democratic organ of the State of Ohio—the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman on what authority he says that Mr. McLean is a Democratic leader?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is a well-understood proposition in Ohio and in the West. He came very near coming to the United States Senate as a representative of the gentleman's party from Ohio.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. How near did he come?

Mr. CONNELL. Does the gentleman mean to say that because he may be a Democratic leader his newspaper is necessarily a Democratic newspaper?

Mr. AUSTIN. In this case the paper is Democratic and its owner a Democrat in good standing.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to have my friends on the other side listen to this editorial first and then, if I have any time, I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, I have read the editorial. I would like to have some information from the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GIVE BUSINESS A CHANCE!

If statesmen of high and low degree are anxious to do something that will meet the approval of an overwhelming majority of the American people and immensely promote the general welfare, let them wind up political agitation and give business a chance.

By business we mean the man with the hoe and the man with the check book; the manager at the desk and the engineer in the cab; the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker; everybody, in short, outside of the halls of legislation.

Every man in the United States who is willing to work ought to have a chance to work. All would have that chance if it were not for unnecessary obstructions and threatened assaults upon business. Most of the people are only too anxious to get busy and keep busy. Why can't they have the chance?

The earth is fruitful, the people are healthy, the machinery of production and distribution is all in place. The United States at this moment should be the busiest, most prosperous, happiest country on the globe. But it is halting and stumbling along, a gigantic weakling, suffering from the infantile paralysis of too much politics.

We do not believe for a moment that a majority of the people are in favor of the continual monkeying with the mechanism of industry. They are not demanding an overhauling of the country by political doctors and legislative tinkers. They are attending to their own business and they wish lawmakers would shut up shop and quit interfering with the business of breadwinning and home making.

Big business is no more vitally affected than little business, except for the fact that more persons are concerned in big business than in little business. The same influence that halts a railroad system paralyzes merchants and builders and farmers along the line, to say nothing of the mechanics and laborers directly employed by the railroad.

Injury or interruption of one business injures and interrupts others. The delay in deciding the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust cases by the United States Supreme Court does no more harm to those concerns than it does to all other business. The harm does not lie in fear of an adverse decision, but in the delay. If the worst were known business would go ahead, but uncertainty paralyzes the will of business from the Atlantic to the Pacific. No engagements can be made for future de-

velopment or extensions. Everybody marks time—not because he is a stockholder in Standard Oil, but because his business is a thread in the complicated web of American industry.

The Government can do nothing better for the people than to permit them to attend to their own affairs. The legislative branch can help by refraining from making or threatening to enact new and experimental laws. The judicial branch can help by telling corporations where they stand.

Give the plain, everyday business man a chance!

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I have been immensely interested as well as greatly benefited by the very able discussion which has been carried on upon this question on both sides of this Chamber, and I fear I can add little to what has already been said upon the important questions and items of which I would speak. I plead in defense of rising at all to speak upon the question the great interest the people of my district have in this bill. I represent, in the twelfth district of Missouri, one of the most important districts in this country from the standpoint of the tariff and of protection. The district that I represent is the second wealthiest district in this country. It has engaged thousands of men in various lines of pursuits, especially of manufacturing, and it is only to express to this House and to this country their ideas upon this bill that I rise at all.

It has been said upon this floor that this proposed law is for the benefit of certain sections of the country and will be to the harm and detriment of other sections. While I believe that to be true, I do not charge that the majority have had such in view in their proposal of this law. The only trouble that there is with the people of my district is not because they have not plenty of work to do, but their only complaint is that the cost of living is too high. I voted for the reciprocity bill, believing that that would, in a large measure, reduce the cost of living; and I still believe that it will. I agree on that question with what the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] said in his address, when discussing this matter. He said:

I think I demonstrated beyond dispute, for no reply has yet been made by anybody to the proposition, that the higher cost of living which now obtains in this country was due to an enormously increased demand for food products and a proportionately decreased productive power on our part, and that this great change, due largely to immigration and a transition from agriculture to manufacturing, had begun on the Atlantic coast and was steadily moving westward, until now its influence was effective and controlling in the Central West.

I pointed out also that the transference of millions upon millions of the food-producing classes from the nations of Europe into the manufacturing industries of this country had made the tendency to a higher cost of living world-wide; and I expressed my sincere belief that the continuation of high prices for food products was inevitable and that the only possible effect of complete freedom of exchange of all natural products between the United States and Canada would be to temporarily retard the rapid advances and to steady the fluctuations of the prices of the fast-diminishing export surplus of many of the food products of both countries, and that a considerable period of time would be necessary for a permanent readjustment of the present world-wide conditions of the cost of living.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that is the only solution of the question of the high cost of living, that the production has not been equal to the demand, and it is only by opening up the agricultural markets of Canada, which I do not believe will hurt materially any section of this country, as has been charged upon this floor, that we will get relief.

In voting for reciprocity with Canada I did not vote for free trade with the world. Free trade and reciprocity are not twins, as has been charged upon this floor. Some one has stated here that they were twin sisters—reciprocity and this free-list bill. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that they are any relation at all, not even fifty-first cousins. Protection and reciprocity have been the handiwork of the party that has developed this country's wonderful resources and made it a great country.

It is these policies of the Republican Party which has made and protected American workingmen in the factories and the mills. There is more work to-day for the laboring man in this country than there has ever been before. He is not crying for work to-day. He wants more to eat and for less money. I am with him on that, and hope he gets it through this reciprocity with Canada. One thing is certain, the relief must come through and by the Republican Party, as the Democratic Party is not now and never has been equal to the occasion. Democracy is good at tearing down, but not good at building.

Mr. Chairman, I could not, in the short time allotted to me, discuss the various items of this bill, but would speak especially of two industries, which thrive in my district, as examples of the unfairness of this bill:

First, let me call your attention to the second page of this bill and the articles it puts on the free-trade basis, if it becomes a law, beginning with line 3 and ending with line 10, and being in words as follows:

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow,

Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

In the city of St. Louis we have hundreds of men and women who are working in the manufacture of various kinds of bagging. Should this bill become a law, this industry in my district would be ruined and the mills closed. This business has been crippled already by the present low tariff on the material from which bagging, and so forth, is manufactured. To show that the conditions in regard to this bagging business exists not only in my city but in other places, I call your attention to a statement that has been issued by the Carolina Bagging Co., at Henderson, N. C., under date of April 24, and which is as follows, in part:

The "farmers' free-list bill" just introduced in Congress proposes to admit jute into this country free. This product grows in India and nowhere else. Conditions there require payment by jute manufacturers of an average of about 50 cents per week to their laborers. This is very shocking, but it is taken from their government report for the year 1910.

The duty on cotton bagging, which is made of jute, is about 30 cents per roll. With this small amount of protection manufacturers of bagging and other jute products have had a hard time to live for the last few years. Several factories have failed and gone out of business.

But there are now seven bagging factories in North Carolina, three in South Carolina, three in Virginia, and three in Georgia. Large amounts of capital are invested in these. Admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories, and throw all their labor out of employment. Our factory employs 200 operators, who receive from \$4 to \$40 per week, on which they and their families live. The duty on our annual output of 100,000 rolls is about 30 cents per roll, or \$30,000. Take this from our earnings and we could not go on at all, and would close our factory. May God forbid such a result. We and our help all cry to Congress to forbid it.

Take another view of it. A few years ago there was much talk of using cotton for cotton bagging. At the present prices of cotton of course the farmers can not afford that.

But millions of yards of cotton bagging are used yearly for cement, grain, flour, beans, and other such purposes. If the duty on jute is removed the great and immediate inflow of the manufactured product would supply jute for all these and many other uses now supplied by cotton goods. We would thus, in return for the pitiful sum of about 4 cents a bale duty now paid by the farmer on cotton bagging, have to be taxed in some other way to supply that loss of revenue to the Government, lose our factories to their owners, our wages to the laborers, and sustain a considerable reduction in the use and price of cotton. Thus the prophecy of Bret Harte will be fulfilled: "We are ruined by Chinese cheap labor." We pray that such a calamity may be averted.

That, Mr. Chairman, is from North Carolina, where industries have grown up, such as these and others in the manufacturing line through the Southern States, by reason of this protective tariff that the Republican Party has enacted.

From the conditions prevailing in this industry in my own city, and the facts and figures that have come to me from them, I am satisfied that the statement from the Carolina Bagging Co. is true, and I will not burden the RECORD with a statement as to the figures and conditions that prevail in this industry in my own city, as it is substantially the same as that of the Carolina Bagging Co., and of all the factories engaged in that business in this country, including the Brooklyn mills that turn out a great deal of the jute bagging for cotton baling that is used in this country. Already about 20 per cent of jute bagging is imported from Calcutta, and if you admit it free they will import all, and the ruinous results of free trade, as applied to this industry, will be seen in the extinguishing of the fires of the mills and the idleness of American laborers engaged in this work.

I have a telegram here, Mr. Chairman, and a letter from H. & L. Chase Bag Co., of St. Louis, making substantially the same complaint and objecting to the passage of this bill as that which I have read into the RECORD from the Carolina Bagging Co., of Henderson, N. C., and I ask leave to insert it in the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

H. & L. CHASE BAG CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., April 24, 1911.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Learning that the Underwood bill was likely to come up for discussion to-day in your honorable body, and being vitally affected in the jute industry, we confirm our telegram sent you this morning reading as follows:

"Before voting on change affecting jute goods, schedule J, please give opportunity for a committee representing this industry to appear before the Ways and Means Committee."

We trust that through your efforts we may at least have chance to be heard.

Yours, respectfully,

H. & L. CHASE BAG CO.

There is another item in this bill that is vitally important to the St. Louis district that I represent, and that is the one which refers to the boot and shoe industry. I call your attention to the second page of said bill, beginning with line 17 and ending with line 24 of said page, as follows:

Grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather; band, bend, or belting leather; boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery,

in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

I will not go into the details of this industry, as it has ably and minutely been discussed in this House in the last few days by several Members of this House, and I ask you to carefully read and consider what they said upon this matter before you vote to take the duty off of this class of goods.

Just for a moment, to give you an idea of the importance of this industry as it applies only to my district, I will state that the boot and shoe manufacturers in that district, with American labor, in the year 1910, made 26,300,000 pairs of shoes; that the cost of the manufacture of these shoes was \$40,000,000; wages paid were \$8,100,000; the average net profits were under 5 per cent; a very small portion of these shoes were shipped to foreign countries, but practically all were sold in this country. The average wages paid to shoe cutters in the city of St. Louis were \$16 a week. For the same class of work the shoe cutters in foreign countries receive about \$7 a week. Reduce the tariff, if you will, on these goods, and the products necessary in the manufacture thereof, and you will cripple these industries, probably close some of the factories, and surely reduce the price of wages paid to the American workmen.

And not only, Mr. Chairman, does this industry affect this district in the importance I have called to your attention, but you all know there are men engaged in the sale of these shoes, retail and otherwise, throughout the various States of this country. It not only affects the shoe companies which are in my district, but it also affects them in their relation with the States of Missouri and Illinois. Some of these shoe companies have factories in those States.

It has been said to-day here on the floor of this House by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and it has been repeatedly charged and stated here, that there never has been any claim of a trust or a combination in the shoe industry. Then why would you tear them down? Why would you even cripple them? And why would you take away from them this small pittance of protection that they now have? Do you want to reduce the prices they are now paying to the workmen engaged in this industry? Do you think \$16 a week for shoe cutters is too much? Would you have them receive the same as the foreign cutters in foreign lands now get, of about \$7 a week? That is not the way to reduce the price of living and the cost of living.

It has been only a few years back, Mr. Chairman, when it was cheap to live, if you only had the money to buy. I remember the time, not many years ago, when I was upon my father's farm in Missouri, when we could not get anything for the products that we raised. It was because of the tariff legislation that had been enacted by the Democratic Party, and because of the harmful effects on American industries. Idleness was in the cities, and there was no market for the goods, and you could then truly say that the cost of living was cheap. But they had nothing with which to buy the products.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to free shoes, etc., that this bill would bring into this country free, there is a long list of materials that every shoe manufacturer must use, but which this committee has not included in this bill. This list includes many kinds of leather and tanning materials used in producing leather, such as cloth for linings, canvas, threads, blackings, cement, nails, tacks, wire, and so forth, all of which are free to the manufacturers of England, however, and of some other countries. This gives the foreign manufacturers an unfair advantage.

The reduction of the tariff on shoes to the present 10 per cent has reached the danger limit, and I sincerely hope that the intelligence and patriotism of this House will allow its best judgment to prevail in their refusal to pass this bill, and that it will forget, if such is possible here, political issues and political campaigns of the future and fix our minds and our attention upon that which is for the best interests of this whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the laws that are enacted should be laws that are best for the majority of the people and not for any particular portion of them or any particular section of them.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would call the attention of this House to, and that is a statement prepared by the New England Shoe and Leather Association at a meeting of their board of directors held on the 22d of April of this year. It is as follows:

The proposal to put leather and boots and shoes on the free list seems to make it necessary to consider conditions as now existing in this industry.

At the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill a very thorough investigation of these conditions, both at home and abroad, was made. It will be remembered that certain manufacturers of shoes stated at

that time that if hides and other necessary materials were made free no protection for shoes would be needed.

This statement aroused a very earnest discussion, and inquiries were made in the principal markets of Europe; samples were obtained, examined, and appraised; labor costs were ascertained; and the decision seemed to be thoroughly established that certain grades of American shoes, value of which was given chiefly by their style and finish, could successfully compete with foreign productions. On other grades, where the American ideas in regard to style and fit were not as important, it was found that the shoes abroad were being sold at somewhat less than prices current in this country, and that without a moderately protective tariff manufacturers in this country would be subjected to unfair competition, and the wages of labor would necessarily be somewhat reduced.

It was also found that the German tanners had made great progress in the tanning and finishing of calfskins and upper leather, and that, owing to the lower cost of labor, chemicals, and tanning materials generally, upper leather was being produced in foreign countries at less than the cost in America.

The shoe and leather industry has never claimed the protection of high tariff rates, and in accordance with its traditional policy it freely consented to very important reductions in the rates on all classes of leather and shoes at the time of the enactment of the last tariff bill. The rates established were intentionally made as low as possible without jeopardizing the manufacturing interests and the wages of the employees.

The duties as they now stand are so low as to be on practically a revenue basis.

Since these rates were established, such changes as have occurred in the situation have been against rather than in favor of the domestic manufacturer.

Modern machinery and factory methods have been rapidly introduced, and the foreign manufacturer of shoes now stands more nearly on the American level of efficiency than ever before. Under these circumstances and in view of the added cost of tanning material in this country on account of the tariff and the consequent higher cost of leather, and in view of the fact that the shoe workers in the United States obtain from two to four times the wages paid in European countries, the proposal to make shoes and leather free must be considered as without reasonable cause or excuse.

The shoe and leather industry asks no favors of Congress. They claim to have developed a much higher condition of comparative efficiency than has been established by other and kindred industries, and desire simply a fair chance to continue their development under such conditions as are in every way to the advantage of the American consumer. The products of their tanneries and factories have established the standard for equality the world over, and have been distributed to the consumers at prices at least as low as those current anywhere on earth. The tariff on shoes has never cost the wearer of shoes in the United States one cent, and free trade in shoes will do nothing toward cheapening the footwear of the farmer or lessening by one cent his necessary expenses.

Shoes made either at home or abroad must pay the producer a small margin of profit. The shoes produced in the United States under conditions of the most intense competition do not pay the manufacturer an average profit of more than about 4 per cent. The foreign manufacturer certainly would not work for less. The lower cost of labor, machinery, and materials abroad is only partially offset in this country by production on a larger scale and more efficient and systematic handling of the machinery and materials employed. The cost of the finished product is to-day slightly less on most grades in Europe than in America, and in some styles, where handwork is largely employed, the margin in favor of Europe is very wide.

For the past 10 years Europe has been constantly studying our methods and adopting our machinery. To-day she is fully on an equality with us in the production of machinery, and is organizing her industry to secure for her manufacturers the benefit of the larger production and more systematic and efficient methods which we now enjoy. At the present moment there are in the shoe factories of this country at least five representatives of the largest shoe manufacturing companies in Europe, sent here by their employers for the purpose of study and investigation of American methods.

Under conditions as they exist at the present time there can be no doubt that the advantage of European manufacturers will continue to increase for the present, and the result of the removal of the very slight protection now afforded would be to divide the market between the domestic and foreign manufacturers without result in material saving in cost to the consumer.

I also have here, Mr. Chairman, a telegram and a letter from the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis, begging that this tariff be not disturbed. They say that foreign manufacturers have free material and nonroyalty machinery, and labor about half that paid in this country. The tariff on shoes is only 10 per cent, whereas on other wearing apparel it is much more. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? Why not reduce the tariff upon sugar? They earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions. That is signed, Mr. Chairman, by the Brown Shoe Co., the Carruthers-Jones Shoe Co., and 11 other big shoe manufacturers of the city of St. Louis, including the Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co., which company, I want to state here, has the contract for furnishing shoes to the Army, and it was not the company that was charged here upon the floor the other day, with headquarters in Boston, that has a monopoly upon it. The shoe companies of St. Louis have been having these contracts for years and have been supplying most of the shoes that have been worn by the soldiers, and it is because, Mr. Chairman, the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis produce the best shoes in the land.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a telegram and letter from them upon this subject:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 26, 1911.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Foreign manufacturers have free material and nonroyalty machinery and labor at about one-half paid in this country. Can we compete under these conditions if shoes are free? The tariff on shoes is only 10 per

cent, whereas all other wearing apparel averages about 60 per cent. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? We earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions.

Brown Shoe Co., Carruthers-Jones Shoe Co., Geo. F. Dittmann Boot & Shoe Co., Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co., John Meier Shoe Co., Roberts, Johnson, Rand Shoe Co., Burrow-Jones Dyer Shoe Co., Desnoyers Shoe Co., Friedman-Shelby Shoe Co., Johansen Bros. Shoe Co., Peters Shoe Co., Wertheimer-Swartz Shoe Co.

Also the following letter from a shoe manufacturer of St. Louis:

MY DEAR MR. DYER: Your night telegram, asking for data regarding shoe industry of St. Louis, received. We appreciate very much your interest and have sent you night telegram, reading as follows:

"Answering your telegram, the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis made last year about 26,300,000 pairs of shoes. Producing cost, \$40,000,000; wages, \$8,100,000; average net profits under 5 per cent. Very small portion shipped foreign countries. Shoe cutters have received average \$16 weekly; same work some foreign countries, \$7 weekly. We believe free shoes would result in a large reduction in wages or closed factories."

The figures given were obtained from the publishers of the Shoe Trade Paper in St. Louis, and we believe they are approximately correct.

The undersigned has visited representative shoe factories in Europe within the last year, when he investigated the question of foreign shoes being shipped to this country, and it is his judgment that free shoes would be a very serious matter to the shoe workers, as well as the shoe manufacturers, of this country.

BROWN SHOE CO.,
J. H. ROBLEE, Vice President.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

St. Louis is in the State of Missouri, and Missouri is the greatest State in the Union, as my Democratic friends of this House have testified to by selecting for its Speaker our distinguished son and our first citizen, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. [Applause.] While I am not a prophet, and never had any experience in prophecy, I will say this, Mr. Chairman, which is a little away from my subject, that if the Democracy of this country wants the ablest and the best and the greatest Democrat in the country for the White House they will nominate and try their best to elect him to that position. [Applause.]

I have other letters and telegrams here, Mr. Chairman, from the shoe-manufacturing industries of St. Louis and from the district which I have the honor to represent here in this House. One of those letters, which I have read in part, has given to you the names of those men who are engaged in that industry, and they are interested, and all of the people of St. Louis are interested, in this subject.

We are not here, Mr. Chairman, pleading for capital especially, but we are here pleading for the interests of the workmen. One of the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis stated to me that last year he visited all the representative shoe factories in Europe, where he investigated the question of foreign shoes that are being shipped to this country, and it is his judgment that free shoes would be a very serious matter to the shoe workers as well as to the shoe manufacturers of this country.

A letter addressed to me from another large manufacturer in my district is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 26, 1911.

Hon. L. C. DYER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are going to be asked to take off the present 10 per cent duty on shoes, and we trust that you will not do so.

Census of manufactures, city of St. Louis, Mo. Preliminary totals.
(Comparative summary, 1899, 1904, and 1909.)

	Census.			Per cent of increase.		
	1909	1904	1899	1904 to 1909	1899 to 1904	1899 to 1909
Number of establishments.....	2,667	2,482	2,646	7	1 6	1
Capital.....	\$268,491,000	\$265,937,000	\$150,526,000	1	77	78
Cost of materials used.....	\$187,599,000	\$137,740,000	\$101,838,000	36	35	84
Salaries and wages.....	\$68,105,000	\$56,117,000	\$39,224,000	21	43	74
Miscellaneous expenses.....	\$40,821,000	\$37,183,000	\$27,404,000	10	36	49
Value of products.....	\$327,676,000	\$267,307,000	\$193,733,000	23	38	69
Value added by manufacture (products, less cost of materials).....	\$140,077,000	\$129,567,000	\$91,895,000	8	41	52
Employees:						
Number of salaried officials and clerks.....	15,349	11,381	8,867	35	28	73
Average number of wage earners employed during the year.....	87,097	82,698	64,832	5	28	34

¹ Decrease.

St. Louis, as the above figures show, has become the great manufacturing city it has through the Republican policy of protection. Free trade will retard its progress and ruin many of its industries.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to this Democratic House and its leaders that what I have presented here have been facts and

Our American workmen can compete with the English, the French, and the Germans, and, on an equal basis, they can beat them, but the difference in the cost of living over there and the cost of living here is so great that if we had to meet European conditions it would mean disaster to the trade.

The duty, before the last change, we think was 20 per cent, and they cut it down to 10 per cent, which is as little as it ought to be, when you consider the fact that wages in this country average about 100 per cent more than they do over on the other side. This difference in wages can not come out of the manufacturers' profits, because, with one or two exceptions, there is hardly a shoe house in the country to-day that is making more than a living.

Conditions are exceedingly discouraging in the shoe-manufacturing trade and any further burden, such as is proposed by this increased reduction of tariff, would be the "straw to break the camel's back." To the shoe industry of your State this constitutes an exceedingly important item, and we hope you will give it your very earnest and careful consideration.

DESNOYERS SHOE CO.,
By W. L. DESNOYERS, President.

Mr. Chairman, I would also, with your permission and with the permission of the House, call your attention to the following figures on imports and exports to show to you that there is already being imported into this country millions of dollars' worth of goods in the bagging and shoe industries:

Imports and exports for 12 months ending December, 1910.

(Compiled from the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance, December, 1910.)

	Imports.	Exports of domestic merchandise.
Manufactures of—		
Bagging, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton.....	\$3,383,171
Burlaps or plain woven fabrics of single jute yarn.....	21,329,239
Hides and skins, other than fur skins, raw or uncured.....	86,107,728
Leather and tanned skins and manufactures thereof....	16,558,059	\$53,511,761

As to the number of establishments and number of wage earners engaged in the boot and shoe industry in my district and of the value of their products, I will read a statement of the preliminary totals of 1909, compared with 1904, showing also the progress that this industry has been making in St. Louis, as prepared from the records of the Bureau of United States Census, to wit:

Preliminary totals for 1909, compared with 1904.

	Census.	Number of establishments.	Average number of wage earners.	Value of products.
Boots and shoes.....	1909	28	11,081	\$27,779,000
	1904	18	9,234	19,101,000
Boot and shoe uppers, cut stock, and findings.....	1909	5	1,057	6,192,000
	1904	4	97	561,000
Leather, tanned, curried, and finished....	1909	9	220	2,035,000
	1904	7	211	1,107,000

I also invite your attention to some figures from the Bureau of the Census as to number of manufacturing establishments, men employed therein, and so forth, in city of St. Louis, to wit:

"nightmare of calamity for wage earners and business men." It has been intimated upon this floor during this debate that the Democratic majority is engaged in the ripping up of the protective tariff, and the dealing with the subject in such a way as to promote the chances of the party to carry the country next year. While I do not charge your party with that in this House, I trust you will let me call your attention to the year 1893. Then you were about to take charge of all branches of the Government. You had convinced the people of that day that your principles of free trade and tariff for revenue only were for their best interests. Your lease of power was, however, brief, for the people soon revoked the power which they had given to you. Your theories and the putting of some of them into law caused a halting in business enterprises and the loss of confidence, and at the first opportunity the people turned again to the Republican Party, that party which has protected American wages and American industries, and which has made this country great in agriculture, great in manufacturing, and great in mining. You gentlemen of the majority in this House may by your votes here establish free trade upon the various items mentioned in this bill, so far as you have the power to do so, but remember that you are attacking a policy which the great American people have many times favored, and which has brought them happiness, prosperity, and contentment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that after the members of this committee remain in this Hall another hour, if any of them do, they need have no fear that they may not be able to get insurance on their lives hereafter. [Laughter.]

The subject of taxation is an interesting one from many viewpoints. There are two well-defined schools in this country in regard to the use of the taxing power of the Government, one believing that a tax should be laid upon imports for the sole purpose of raising revenue to support the Government, and that it should be laid as lightly as possible upon the prime necessities of life, to the end that the burdens of labor may be lightened, the other believing that taxes should be levied for the purpose of protecting American industries without regard to raising revenue or the articles upon which it should be levied. Certain classes of people may differ as to what constitutes prime necessities of life, but the people at large no longer differ as to what constitutes these things. They have learned by the school of experience that those things are necessities that enable them to live and pursue their daily toil. Among them may be mentioned food, raiment, and shelter.

While it is impossible in this day of "greed and graft" to equitably adjust these differences, but as far as possible I deem it our duty to attempt it. I recognize that almost all legislation here must of necessity be a compromise, either in the committee framing it or in Congress passing it. This must be so in the very nature of things, where nearly 400 men, representing all walks and stations in life—from the farm, factory, bank, and courthouse—come men not only from continental United States but our Territories and foreign possessions, in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, all having an equal voice in shaping legislation. In 1908 the Republican Party swept the country by an unprecedented majority in both the electoral college and popular vote. It gained its victory by a solemn promise to revise the tariff and to revise it downward.

In March, 1909, it undertook the redemption of its promise, and on August 5 of that year concluded its labor by bringing forth a measure worse than the "tariff of abominations" passed by the forefathers of the Republican Party in 1828; and as the people in righteous indignation rose up then and rebuked the party for imposing burdens upon them greater than they could bear, the people last fall rose in the power of their might and with their ballots smote the giant interests of the country "hip and thigh," with the result that to-day there are hardly enough Members on the Republican side of the Chamber to be pallbearers to the funeral of the "lame-duck" brigade who quit making tariff laws on the 4th of last March.

I recognize that no party can accept power without accepting responsibility, and the Democratic Party now gladly accepts the responsibility, so far as this branch of Congress is concerned. After legislation leaves here the responsibility is yours, not ours. We propose to give the people some relief, and if you block it, either at the other end of this Capitol or at the western end of the Avenue, the responsibility is yours. The Canadian trade agreement, initiated by a Republican President and negotiated by a Republican Secretary of State, passed

this House the other day with 280 votes for and 67 votes against it. Most of the votes against it were cast by the old Napoleonic "stand-pat guard," men who see no good in anything that tends to reduce the cost of living or that lightens the burden of labor, men who would apply the rule of exclusion, excluding from our markets any foreign manufactured goods which by any process could be manufactured in this country, regardless of the effect it may have on the millions of consumers of manufactured goods, were it not for the revenue involved, and men who no doubt have aided in enacting tariff laws in the past the rates of duty of which have been so high as to become prohibitory in their effect.

The opponents of that measure directed the bulk of their argument against placing wheat on the free list; hoisting the signal of despair, predicting dire ruin to all our farmers should the agreement be enacted into law, the moment they come in competition with the wheat fields of Canada. If it brings ruin to our farmers, then it is radically wrong. If it does not affect them, then out of your own mouths you will stand condemned. Let us see. There has been a rate of duty of some kind almost for half a century on wheat, the rate varying from 25 to 50 cents per bushel. Has this rate of duty had anything to do with keeping up the price of wheat in this country? If so, why has its price fluctuated up and down? Within the memory of all here the price of wheat has ranged from 75 cents to \$1.50 per bushel. Does anyone believe for a moment that a rate of duty on wheat can keep the price of it up in this country while we continue to raise more than 100,000,000 bushels per year than we consume, and which must find a market abroad?

What has kept up the price of wheat? Has it been the rate of duty of 25 cents per bushel upon it, or has it been the demand made upon us for our wheat surplus? If it has been the demand, I care not whether it be a home or a foreign demand, the principle is the same. If the price of wheat is kept up by the demand for it, then the argument against the trade agreement proposing to take the duty off of wheat falls to the ground of its own weight and needs no answer. To the man who answers that the price of wheat has been kept up by a rate of duty, I then ask him the question, Why has this price fluctuated? Why has the price not been stable in this country, one and the same price every day in the year since the duty was placed upon it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There has been no variation in the rate of duty; it has been one and the same rate since its adoption. In the last analysis, the opponents of the Canadian trade agreement are driven to the admission that the price of wheat has been kept up in this country, not by reason of a rate of duty upon it, but by a demand for the commodity. In other words, its price has been kept up by the inevitable law of supply and demand.

Suppose all these years that we have had a duty on wheat we would have had an embargo duty against its exportation; if our farmers had gone on raising a hundred million surplus each year more than we consumed, does anyone believe a tariff on wheat at the rate of \$25 per bushel under these conditions could or would have kept up its price in this country? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every sane man answers this question "No." Then every honest man whose desire is to enlighten the people should admit that a tariff on wheat in this country adds nothing to the selling price as long as we continue to be heavy exporters of it. While we have been raising and exporting wheat for decades in the past where has the surplus of both nations gone during these years? Canada's surplus has not come to this country nor has ours gone to Canada, but the surplus of both countries has gone to the empty granaries of the world. It has gone to the countries paying the most for it. If this agreement becomes a law, will our farmers quit raising wheat? Canada can not find a market for her surplus wheat in this country unless our farmers, contrary to all their past splendid history, yield up the battle and retire from the field in dishonor, something I am sure they will not do. If placed on an equal footing with the Canadian farmer in getting cheaper farming implements, I entertain no doubt but what the American farmer can and will compete with his Canadian brother in raising and selling wheat in any of the world's markets.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will yield for a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman asserts that the surplus fixes the price of wheat.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Oh, the gentleman does not get the force of my statement. I said the demand fixed the price of wheat.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, will the gentleman answer this question: If Canada raises the same quality of wheat that

we do—that the Northwestern States raise, No. 1 hard wheat—and the surplus goes into the empty granaries of the world and the demand fixed the price, why is it that for the last 10 or 20 years there has been a difference in the price in the United States and across the border for the same grade of wheat; why has it been higher in this country than in Canada?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman's question answers itself. If he means by this question that the price of wheat during this period of time has been higher in this country than in Canada, then he need have no fear whatever about Canadian wheat being shipped into this country and driving its price down. On the other hand, if he means that the price during this period of time has been higher in Canada than in the United States, this condition may be due to local conditions; it may be due to transportation. Local demands may enter into the question. I have seen in my own county, on the same line of railroad, in towns not more than 15 miles apart, the price of wheat vary on the same day from 2 to 5 cents per bushel. This is due entirely to local conditions.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. But the Canadian methods of exports are better than those from Minneapolis, with cheaper freight rates.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That may be due entirely to local conditions. Does the gentleman believe that the farmers of Minnesota will stop raising wheat if the Canadian trade agreement will become a law?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; but they will have to sell it at the Canadian price.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Oh, yes; your howl about the farmers of the country and the destruction of the price of wheat is nothing but the wail of the old standpatter, who sees the mountain of protection giving way under ceaseless and constant hammering on the part of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I assure the gentleman that does not apply to me, because I am not a standpatter.

Mr. COX of Indiana. You see plainly the handwriting on the wall; you see the strong citadel of protection yielding and giving way. I am glad to see you repent of your sins once in awhile. "While the lamp holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return." The latest convert we have on the proposition of a downward revision of the tariff is none other than President Taft himself. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At last he has come over to our way of thinking, and if he and some more of his brethren on that side of the Chamber will come over with a contrite heart we will welcome them to our fold.

Mr. Chairman, what I have said about wheat applies with equal force to cattle and sheep, hogs and horses. For more than a quarter of a century we have had a duty from \$2 to \$10 per head on cattle, and on hogs and sheep \$1.50 per head, and during this same period of time we have observed the price of these fluctuate up and down. The price of hogs prior to the panic of 1907 ranged from 7 to 8 cents per pound; immediately following the panic the price of hogs dropped to 4 cents per pound, and last year (1910) we saw the price soar to 10 cents per pound, with the same rate of tariff on hogs during this same period of time. If the rate of duty upon hogs had anything to do with bringing the price of hogs up to 10 cents per pound, the same rate of duty certainly brought it down to 4 cents per pound. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. The price of wheat commodities, like the price of wheat, is governed by the immutable law of supply and demand. When the demand is strong and the supply limited, the price goes up; when the demand is limited and the supply is strong, the price goes down, tariff or no tariff, duty or no duty. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that cotton grown in this country without any tariff upon it is a complete answer to those who oppose the Canadian trade agreement for fear it would drive the price of wheat down in this country. The reports of the Secretary of Agriculture say we raised last year 691,767,000 bushels of wheat valued at \$625,000,000, and every bushel of this wheat was protected by a rate of duty of 25 cents per bushel; and he reports during this same year we raised in this country \$900,000,000 worth of cotton, and not a pound of cotton was protected by any rate of duty or any tariff whatever, and for the preceding five years we raised upon an average of \$685,000,000 worth of cotton, a total in value in these six years of \$4,325,000,000, representing more than four and one-half times the total capitalization of all the national banks in the country, and nearly one-third of the value of the 250,000 miles of steam railroads in the country, with cotton all these years upon the free list.

The planter of the South in these short years, though unprotected by way of duty upon his cotton, was meeting and com-

peting with millions of Hindus of India engaged in raising cotton on land where the fertility of the soil is unsurpassed in the world and where pauper labor subsists on a very small rate of wages. Nor is this all; he was competing with Chinese coolie labor, millions strong, where our friends on that side of the Chamber are wont to tell us that labor subsists on rats and mice. Nor is this all; he was competing with the fellahs of Egypt tilling the valley of the Nile, famed for its cotton and biblical lore, where pauper labor in all of its ghost-like specter stalks abroad in the land. This commodity, unprotected as it is, has brought into the country in the past six years more than \$2,000,000,000 worth of foreign gold, and every pound of it, the moment it found a foreign market, had to and did meet in open competition cotton raised by the truly pauper labor of the world. You may ask me how he was able to do it. The question is easily answered. The price of cotton, like the price of wheat and corn, barley and oats, is governed by the ever-unchanging law of supply and demand. The price of cotton during the same years, though having no rate of duty upon it, like the price of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and other commodities having a rate of duty upon them, has continued to fluctuate in price exactly as the price of these other commodities has fluctuated. Last year the combined value of the farmers' products reached the appalling and startling figures of \$8,926,000,000, a sum representing one-fifteenth of the total wealth of the United States; and this vast sum of money was made upon the great staple commodities upon which a rate of duty existed, except cotton.

The farmer has been prosperous no more than he deserves. His prosperity has come to him by dint of his own energy, economy, and thrift, aided by God Almighty's rain and sunshine, together with a heavy demand for his commodities. He has accomplished this in spite of conditions surrounding him, being compelled to pay exorbitant prices for the things he bought from the manufacturers.

Did you ever hear of a multimillionaire farmer in your life? I never heard of but one; he was from Missouri and died last year. [Applause.] For over 40 years the farmer has been the toadstool beneath the harrow of protection, and from his back and the backs of the toiling millions of laboring men and women in this country the high priests of protection have harrowed their millions, until to-day our country from ocean to ocean is filled by multimillionaires, able to pay \$50,000 for a Guttenberg Bible, not for the purpose of learning the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," but for the purpose of having an ancient relic in his library. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Another can pay \$250,000 for the world-famed Hope diamond, others can buy flying machines to sail in the air, and others yachts to ride upon the sea. I can not believe that this professed friendship for the farmer is sincere by men who opposed the Canadian trade agreement, or who oppose the free-list bill now under consideration. The wail of these men reminds me of the old, old song I used to hear, "Hark, from the tomb the doleful sound, mine ears attend the cry." It is the wail of the old standpatter, who plainly sees the handwriting on the wall against protection, needing no Daniel to interpret it, with countless thousands of people in this country daily crying, "Down with protection and up with the equality of right." [Applause on the Democratic side.] You see the ramparts of protection being stormed by a determined host of men and women, who do not propose to capitulate for terms, but who propose to pursue the fight until equality of taxation is restored in this country.

You see its outposts giving way, its picket lines driven in under the splendid leadership of the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which reports this bill, and who, like a patriot, stands undaunted and unmoved by the threats of the great Steel Trust, that was strong and powerful enough to bring a man once President of the United States, and who later braved the lion in its lair amidst the jungles of Africa, to his knees and compelled him to allow it to buy out its only competitor, the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., when everybody knew this to be a violation of law. This man has been threatened by this same monster. It should be the duty not only of Congress but of the people to uphold his hand and support him without regard to party affiliation in a revision of the tariff outlined by him. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that six months ago I was very much in doubt about the wisdom of revising the tariff, a schedule at a time, but I am thoroughly convinced that this is the only safe and sane way to revise it. It is the only way a revision can be brought about in the interest of the people, and I believe that the real downright consternation on the other side of the aisle is due to the cry of the special interests that must soon capitulate and let the people come into their own. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This leads me to a discussion of House bill 4413, known as the free-list bill. I voted for the Canadian reciprocity, because I believed it was right in principle. I intend to vote for this bill because I believe this is right. I am not going to vote for this bill upon the principle that it is a compensatory measure designed to compensate the farmers for any loss that they may sustain by means of the Canadian trade agreement being enacted into law, because I do not think they have or will sustain any loss. Therefore I am going to vote for it because I believe it is right in principle. The Republican Party put forward its heaviest gun, Mr. MANN, of Illinois, to assail the free-list bill. For two hours he discussed the question, not with a view of meeting the facts in the case, but with the hope that he might laugh the case out of court. Let us see what we propose to do in this bill. We propose to put "plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons, and farm carts on the free list."

Is there any controversy about the language in the bill down to this point? The language contained in it so far is so plain "that a fool, though a wayfaring man, need not err as to its meaning." The remaining part of the bill, reading as follows, "And all other agricultural implements of every kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in part, including repair parts," seems to disturb the equilibrium of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], because they say it is hard to tell what is meant by the language contained in this part of the bill. Mr. MANN, while assailing this part of the bill frequently turned to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber and to gentlemen on his own side and on several occasions facetiously asked the question, "What are agricultural implements?" "What constitutes agricultural implements?" And for 30 minutes he read into the record from a catalogue published by Peter Henderson & Co. containing different items, and asked the question, as to whether or not these things—saws, pruning knives, axes, and so forth—were agricultural implements. Does the real fear of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber consist in the fact that they are in doubt as to the true meaning of the bill, or does their fear consist in the fact that possibly under this part of the bill things may be admitted free of duty that gentlemen on that side of the Chamber do not want admitted free of duty? If the language of the bill under consideration or any part of it is doubtful of construction, I will remind the gentlemen that when the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill became a law you established a customs court to try and determine questions relating to imports, and before the special session of Congress adjourned you put through an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of equipping this court, providing it with five judges, a marshal, a clerk, and all paraphernalia necessary to a complete equipment of the court.

If there be any doubt in the language in any part of the bill under consideration, let the customs court decide exactly what is meant by the language contained in the bill. While the gentleman from Illinois may be in doubt as to what are agricultural implements, I desire to say to him that a few years ago a class of men were wise enough to determine what are agricultural implements, and as a result of their combined wisdom they immediately began to form great trusts in the agricultural-implement trade. One of the first of these trusts was the Allis-Chalmers Co., known as the Machinery Trust, an alliance of the Steel Corporation, incorporated in May, 1901. Capitalized for \$36,250,000, the market value of this stock is \$10,000,000; the watered stock, \$25,650,000. It has a monopoly in this line of trade. The farmers of the country are annually assessed not less than 7 per cent in order to pay a dividend upon this watered stock, which represents no value and having no property whatever behind it.

The next trust formed by these wise men was the American Fork & Hoe Co., known as the Farming Tool Trust, organized in 1902, and controls 80 per cent of this line of trade throughout the country, having all the elements of a monopoly in it. It was capitalized for \$4,336,000, and the market value of the stock \$2,000,000, having in it \$2,336,000 of watered stock, on which the farmers of the country are again assessed to pay dividends at the rate of 7 per cent. The next, International Harvester Co., known as the Harvester Trust, under Morgan's influence. This great trust was organized in 1902. The next was the American Seeding Machine Co., known as the Seeding Machine Trust. Capital stock issued, \$15,000,000; market value of this stock, \$3,500,000; watered stock, \$11,500,000.

As compared with this monster all the other trusts relating to farming implements of any kind sink into obscurity. It will be remembered that this huge concern, allied with the steel cor-

poration, was conceived and brought forth by that astute and able financier, Mr. Morgan, of New York. It is capitalized for \$120,000,000. The market value of this stock is only \$20,000,000, representing \$100,000,000 of watered stock. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This concern controls 70 per cent of the output of farming implements in the country, elements of monopoly large. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What is the result of these four trusts engaged in a complete monopoly in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of agricultural implements of all kinds? Their total capitalization is \$175,586,000, and in that capitalization there is \$135,486,000 of watered stock of no value whatever, leaving the true value of the stock of these four concerns only \$40,000,000; yet gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber quibble about the language contained in the bill. Their fear does not consist of the bare fact that the language contained in the bill is not explicit, but it consists in the fact that they are afraid that it might be broad enough to admit free of duty some of the things covered by some or all of these trusts. At the time of the formation of the American Harvester Trust it issued a statement as follows:

The company is capitalized on an exceptionally conservative basis; of its assets \$80,000,000 are in cash working capital. The company will require no financing, and there will be no offer of its stock to the public, all the cash required having been provided by its stockholders. The company has five fully equipped manufacturing plants in the United States—the largest and most complete of their kind in the world—and one plant now in process of construction in Canada. Through its warehouses in various parts of the country it will be able to make the most economical distribution of its manufactured product. It also owns timberland, coal, ore, blast furnace and steel property, by means of which it ought to be able to accomplish important economy in the cost of raw material.

Like Alexander of old, this one trust has conquered 45,000,000 people in this country. It has gone to the Dominion of Canada. It has crossed the Atlantic Ocean, and is to-day bearding the Russian bear in his den. And in less than 10 years it will be compelling the peasants of southern Russia and Siberia to pay a tribute to it, exactly as it is levying its tribute upon 90,000,000 of people in this country to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By reason of its combination, it may be able to economically build these machines and to economically distribute them, but has that economy inured to the benefit of the American farmer? Before this trust was organized, in 1902, the farmers of the country bought their binders at prices not to exceed \$110, or \$115 at most, but since the organization of this trust every farmer to-day is charged a uniform price for his binder of not less than \$125.

But this is not all. Reading from the speech of my friend Mr. MANN, a letter written to him by the International Harvester Co., in which they object to taking the duty off of farming implements in the way in which we propose to do it, by a general bill, instead of by reciprocity, this great trust substantially says in its letter, from which I have quoted, "Let the Government of the United States trade with some other Government some other commodity not manufactured by us, and take the duty off of the other commodity, thereby letting the other Governments take our commodity with our rate of duty in force in this country upon agricultural implements." The statement has been repeatedly made here in the last few days by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber that we have free trade with other nations in farming implements.

I want to read a part of a letter, dated April 25, 1911, from Mr. Curtis, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to me. In speaking about reciprocal trade between this country and other nations in agricultural instruments, he says:

I have the honor to advise you that the principal countries which admit free all or part of the implements there mentioned are the United Kingdom, Argentine Republic, and Russia.

In their letter to Mr. MANN they complain of the high rate of duty Russia has against the American agricultural implements, yet the Secretary of the Treasury informs me that as between the United States and Russia we have free trade in farming implements. What is the purpose of the Harvester Trust in going to Russia and there building its plant? Can it be that they want to employ cheap labor?

Another paragraph of the bill under consideration proposes to put "grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather, made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weights of cattle, of the bovine specie, including calfskins, and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers, or vamps, or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles," upon the free list. The gentleman on the other side assailed this paragraph of the bill upon the ground that it would be unfair to the tanners of the country to put leather upon the free list because a rate of

duty was upon tanner's extracts, and that to put these goods upon the free list would strike down the leather industry, together with the boot and shoe industry of the country. Grant that tanning extracts used by the tanners are upon the dutiable list, what have the tanners been compelling us to do since 1902?

Who constitutes the tanners? It is composed and made up of the Leather Trusts. The statement was made on the floor this morning that there is no such thing as a Boot and Shoe Trust in this country. I know nothing about this; but I do know that there is such a thing in this country as a Leather Trust, and that this trust has been in full force and operation for the past 8 or 10 years, and that it has levied a tribute upon everyone who buys and uses leather in any of its forms to pay a dividend upon its watered stock. The American Hide & Leather Co., known as the Upper Leather Trust, incorporated May 3, 1899, controls 55 per cent of the leather products of the country. Capital stock issued, par value, \$32,716,000; market value of this stock, \$7,500,000; watered stock, \$25,216,000. This is not all.

The United States Leather Co., known as the Leather Trust, total capital issued, par value \$130,444,600; the market value of this stock, \$80,000,000; watered stock, \$70,444,600. It controls from 60 to 75 per cent of the leather business of the country. The watered stock in these two trusts alone amounts to \$95,660,600, upon which every man who buys a pair of shoes for his wife and children must pay tribute to the end that dividends may be paid upon this watered stock. I answer the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber who cry "an unfair deal" because of the fact that tanning extracts used by tanners are upon the dutiable list, that more than 90,000,000 of people are annually assessed an enormous rate of duty to enable these trusts to pay a dividend upon stock issued by them having no value whatever. This same benevolent Leather Trust came to Congress two years ago, pledged the people far and wide that if Congress would put hides upon the free list that the people would be able to buy the finished leather commodity cheaper. They wrote every Member of Congress asking that hides be put on the free list; they procured the merchants throughout our districts to write letters asking us to vote for free hides, and telling us that if we would do so the people would get cheaper boots, shoes, leather, and so forth. Hides went upon the free list. The Government lost annually something like \$2,000,000 which had gone into the Treasury of the United States annually by reason of a duty of 15 per cent on hides. But did the people get cheaper boots, shoes, and leather goods after hides had been placed on the free list? Not so. The Leather Trust had decreed otherwise. Instead of the people getting cheaper finished leather goods, the Leather Trust by means of controlling the hide market immediately increased the price of the finished commodity to the consumer. My judgment is before the price of finished leather goods comes down to the consumer these things must be put upon the free list.

Instead of defending the Leather Trust in this country, as gentlemen on that side have attempted to do, I want to defend the 90,000,000 of people in this country who consume in some way the finished commodity of the hide. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman claim that this bill puts women's and children's shoes upon the free list?

Mr. COX of Indiana. No; I did not say that. But I will say to the gentleman very frankly that if I had the writing of this bill I would put the leather schedule on the free list. But I recognize that we can not accomplish all in one measure. We can not rectify a wrong that has been 40 years in building by one bill. We can only accomplish it piecemeal at a time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We propose to put "barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands, or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples," upon the free list. My friend, Mr. MANN, is very much afraid of the language contained in this part of the bill; afraid the language is broad enough to admit free of duty certain kinds of wire not plainly contained in this paragraph.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. A clothesline, for example.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes; a clothesline. But my only fear, Mr. Chairman, is that it will not be broad enough to admit things into this country under the wire schedule that ought to come in free of duty. This part of the bill under consideration strikes a blow at the great Steel Trust. This trust was organized and capitalized for \$1,100,000,000, \$550,000,000 preferred

stock and \$550,000,000 common stock, representing water. The market value of this stock in December, 1903, was \$760,000,000; watered stock, \$340,000,000. The farmers of the country are annually assessed not less than 7 per cent upon this watered stock, for the sole purpose of enabling the Steel Trust to pay a dividend upon stock having no value whatever and represented by no tangible property. The bill under consideration proposes to put "buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour, and semolins, rye flour, bran, middlings and other offals of grain, oatmeal, and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods, and biscuit, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened" upon the free list.

This paragraph of the bill seems to worry my Republican friends, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. He called particular attention to the language, "all prepared cereal foods," and repeatedly asked the question as to what was meant by cereal foods, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] seemed to be very much perturbed over the same language as to what was meant by it.

I may not know myself, Mr. Chairman, exactly what is meant by the language "cereal food." But there was a class of men in this country a few years ago who knew exactly what was covered by the language cereal food, and they were quick to discover that the people of the country were getting these necessities of life too cheap, and in order to increase their profits, they began the creation of a food trust, until to-day we have in operation four large food trusts, all engaged in increasing the price of these necessities of life to the people.

One of these, known as the "Hominy Trust," capital stock issued \$4,500,000, market value of this stock \$2,000,000, watered stock issued \$2,500,000. The Western Cereal Co., known as the "Oatmeal Trust," total capital stock issued \$4,344,000, market value of stock issued \$2,355,000, watered stock issued \$2,000,000. The Quaker Oats Co., known as the "Cereal Trust," capital stock issued \$12,446,050, market value of stock issued \$8,350,000, watered stock issued \$4,096,050. National Biscuit Co., known as the "Cracker Trust," capital stock issued \$56,524,000, market value \$37,500,000, watered stock \$19,024,000. The bill further proposes to put "beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compound, and lard substitutes; and sausage, and sausage meats" upon the free list. This part of the bill likewise creates consternation in the camp of the gentleman across the aisle for fear that it may have some effect upon the great Meat Trust of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have no data later than 1904 as to the total capitalization of the Meat Trust in this country. But I submit the following data:

<i>Meat Trust.</i>	
NATIONAL PACKING CO.	
Authorized capital stock	\$15,000,000
ARMOUR & CO.	
Capital stock authorized	20,000,000
SWIFT & CO.	
Authorized capital stock	35,000,000
NORTH PACKING & PROVISION CO.	
Authorized capital stock issued	2,400,000
JOHN P. SQUIRES & CO. (Capital stock authorized.)	
Cumulative preferred	\$1,500,000
Common stock	6,000,000
Total stock issued	7,500,000
SCHWARZSCHILD & SULZBERGER CO. (Capital stock authorized.)	
Capital stock issued	5,000,000
ST. LOUIS DRESSED BEEF & PROVISION CO.	
Capital stock	1,125,000
LIBBY, McNEIL & LIBBY.	
Capital stock issued	2,000,000
Total capitalization of all the Meat Trust	\$8,025,000

I have no doubt but what the total capitalization of the Meat Trusts is two or three times larger than the above figures, and all the people of the country are to-day being taxed for the benefit of these trusts to the end that they may be able to pay a dividend upon watered stock. These figures show a startling condition of affairs in this country. The overcapitalization of these great trusts, the watered stock issued by them, upon which the people are annually assessed an enormous amount of money for the sole purpose of paying dividends upon stock having no tangible value whatever is, indeed, a subject to which the people may well turn their attention. I think this is one of the prime causes of the increased cost of living. The data I have given shows that in these trusts alone the market value of the stock is \$987,125,000, while the watered stock represents \$738,677,650.

The people are assessed 7 per cent upon this watered stock, representing no value whatever, and it means taking from them each year more than \$50,000,000 of their money to pay dividends upon no tangible property whatever, and the trusts and capitalization of the same here given by me represents a very small per cent of the total capitalization of all the trusts in the country. It is this, and this alone, that is making the burdens of the people greater than they can bear; and if by putting these things on the free list it will even tend toward restoring competition in the trade in which these trusts are engaged, it will have served its purpose and served it well. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4413) placing agricultural implements and other articles on the free list, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, when he proposes to close the general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that I have a number of requests yet for time, and it looks like the debate would run several days longer. I have no desire to cut off general debate, and I am unable to answer the gentleman exactly.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are quite a number of gentlemen absent who would like to be present, of course, when the vote is taken. Does the gentleman think he will finish this week?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope so. I hope to get through by Thursday, but I want every man who wants to make a speech to have the opportunity to do so.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill H. R. 2936 was changed from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers with the bill (H. R. 25823) providing payment of the volunteers in the Cayuse Indian War, Sixty-first Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. LOUD, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of George H. Keating, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Daniel Hilliard, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse reporting having been made thereon.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until this bill H. R. 4413, the tariff bill, is disposed of, the daily hour of meeting of the House shall be at 11 a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that until the tariff bill, H. R. 4413, is disposed of the daily hour of meeting of the House shall be at 11 a. m. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. That is with the understanding that, ordinarily, the House will adjourn about 5 o'clock?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; my idea is that instead of running until 6 at night, it is better to convene at 11 in the morning and adjourn about 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1911.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6733) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 15), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8137) authorizing the taking of depositions in any district or circuit court of the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 8138) to establish Ash-tabula, Ohio, a subport of entry in the customs collection district of Cuyahoga, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 8139) providing for purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Martins Ferry, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8140) to amend the act of February 6, 1907, of the pension laws so as to include artisans and members of the construction corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8141) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8142) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8143) granting pensions to members of the military organization of 1862 known as "Squirrel Hunters"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 8144) to regulate and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8145) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate memorial and burial place of Maj. Gen. Arthur Saint Clair; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 8146) to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8147) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 8148) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bangor, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8149) to increase the pensions of those who have lost one eye or have become totally blind in one eye from causes occurring in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8150) authorizing the improvement of the Government road in Lauderdale County, Ala., from the Muscle Shoals Canal to the Huntsville Road, and the extension of the same from the intersection of the Government Road, Florence and Huntsville Roads, to Florence, a distance of 8 miles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8151) providing for the adjustment of the grant of lands in aid of the construction of the Corvallis and Yaquina Bay military wagon road and of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of said grant; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8152) to provide for entering the surfaces of certain mineral lands in Alabama; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8153) granting certain lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Alabama to the State of Alabama for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) to amend section 13 of the naturalization law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8155) to further regulate the exclusion of undesirable aliens from admission into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8156) to pay rural mail carriers the sum of 10 cents per mile per day for each mile and fraction of a mile on routes of over 24 miles; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8157) giving rural mail carriers holiday on the 25th day of December of each year; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8158) to prevent graft by prohibiting the giving or receiving of gifts, employment, or compensation from certain corporations by Senators, Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners in the Congress of the United States, or Senators, Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners elect, and the judges and

Justices of the United States courts, and prescribing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8159) to regulate the business of insurance within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8160) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building thereon for the accommodation of the United States post office at Reading, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 142) in favor of closer trade relations with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8161) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Whitelaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8162) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Koch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8163) granting an increase of pension to John Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8164) granting an increase of pension to Moses Goldstein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8165) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8166) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holtham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8167) granting a pension to Joseph Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) granting an increase of pension to Etta A. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8169) granting an increase of pension to James Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8170) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dempsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) granting an increase of pension to William A. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) granting an increase of pension to Alden Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8175) granting an increase of pension to Marcus M. Bancroft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8176) granting an increase of pension to David Curran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8177) granting an increase of pension to William H. Courser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8178) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to Helena M. Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Livers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Deverix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8182) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Zaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Buxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8184) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8185) granting an increase of pension to Mary Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8186) granting an increase of pension to William E. Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Nowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Harriet F. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to Mark Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8190) granting an increase of pension to John S. Cochrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to Alma E. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Coburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to George H. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) granting an increase of pension to Kirk F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to William Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Walter White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Annie G. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) granting an increase of pension to Louis S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Mark Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lonergan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8205) granting an increase of pension to Michael E. Breck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8206) granting an increase of pension to James W. Grayson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) granting an increase of pension to William Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8208) granting an increase of pension to William D. Lamb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) granting an increase of pension to Winslow Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Edgerton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) granting an increase of pension to James E. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8212) granting an increase of pension to Martin Larney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8213) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eaton Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8214) granting an increase of pension to John W. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8215) granting an increase of pension to Emma Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8216) granting an increase of pension to Levi J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) granting an increase of pension to Walter H. Farwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8218) granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Kinsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8219) granting an increase of pension to William J. Bastian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8221) granting an increase of pension to Kate T. Dimon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8222) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel R. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8223) granting an increase of pension to William I. Bastian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8224) granting a pension to Peter Breen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) granting a pension to Inez M. Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to John Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8227) granting a pension to George S. Kittredge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8228) granting a pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8229) granting a pension to Frank Maguire; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8230) granting a pension to Algernon Weymouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8231) granting a pension to Dennis H. Finn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8232) granting a pension to Frank Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8233) granting a pension to Michael Lanergan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) granting a pension to Thomas H. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) granting a pension to Eleanor Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) granting a pension to Marcella E. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8237) granting a pension to Charles J. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8238) granting a pension to James Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8239) granting a pension to James E. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8240) granting a pension to Margaret E. Canty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) granting a pension to Arthur Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8242) granting a pension to Josephine McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8243) granting a pension to Henry Reilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8244) granting a pension to Winfield S. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) granting a pension to Michael Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8246) granting a pension to William Fairbrother; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8247) correcting the military record of Edward McLaughlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) to correct the military record of Orlando Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8249) to correct the military record of Alonzo Vining; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8250) for the relief of Charles M. Peirce; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8251) for the relief of Daniel Walsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8252) for the relief of Hercules Vancourt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8253) for the relief of Henry C. Bliss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8254) for the relief of Michael H. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8255) for the relief of Matthew Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8256) for the relief of Patrick McGarry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8257) for the relief of Charles Bates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8258) for the relief of Orlando Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8259) for the relief of Dennis E. White, administrator of the estate of Buckner and Sarah Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) for the relief of the estate of Mark S. Gorrill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8261) in the interest of Gilbert P. Cotton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8262) to remove charge of desertion against Lawrence Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8263) granting permission to Col. John P. Wisser to accept a photograph of the Emperor of Germany, presented by the German Empire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8264) to correct the military record of Samuel Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8265) to correct the military record of James L. Bowers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8266) to correct the military record of James Burroes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8267) to correct the military record of William H. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8268) to correct the military record of Lyman Knapp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8269) to correct the military record of John M. Bassler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8270) to correct the military record of Charles Beach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8271) to correct the military record of John Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8272) to correct the military record of Charles E. Creager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8273) to correct the military record of George W. Ball; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8274) to correct the military record of Charles Hotelling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8275) to correct the military record of Lewis Corfman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8276) for the relief of Samuel Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8277) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Samuel Zellner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8278) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Benjamin F. Church; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8279) granting an increase of pension to William T. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8280) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8281) granting a pension to Catharine Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8282) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Steffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8283) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8284) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8285) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8286) granting an increase of pension to William Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8287) granting an increase of pension to Amos L. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8288) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8289) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8290) granting an increase of pension to Frances Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8291) granting an increase of pension to George F. Amos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8292) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Minton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8293) granting a pension to Samuel D. Minor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8294) granting a pension to Annie Abney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8295) granting a pension to Jesse G. Lott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8296) granting a pension to Pauline E. Hauk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8297) granting a pension to John H. Pepper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8298) granting a pension to Robert A. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8299) granting a pension to Posey Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8300) granting a pension to Lawson L. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8301) granting a pension to William F. Hass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8302) granting a pension to Daniel T. Youngblood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to P. J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8304) granting a pension to Seborn Fasset; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8305) granting a pension to Mary Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8306) granting a pension to Susan M. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8307) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hullett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8308) granting a pension to Jerry Wildman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8309) granting a pension to John F. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8310) granting a pension to Henry Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8311) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Driskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8312) granting a pension to J. L. Marbut, alias John Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8313) granting a pension to Alexander Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8314) granting a pension to Daniel B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8315) granting a pension to James M. Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8316) granting a pension to Nancy L. Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8317) granting a pension to Mary Walls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of D. W. Jarrett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8319) for the relief of Mary Trayler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8320) for the relief of Nathan Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8321) for the relief of Mrs. S. V. Burks, late postmaster at Vinemont, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8322) for the relief of A. L. Hays; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8323) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Willoughby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8324) for the relief of James D. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8325) for the relief of W. D. Clay and others, heirs of James W. Clay, deceased; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8326) for the relief of Jesse J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8327) for the relief of the estate of Allen T. Estes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8328) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Blakemore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8329) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert A. Godsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8330) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of F. M. Bruce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8331) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph A. Choate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8332) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Guthrie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8333) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Denson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8334) to authorize James Pitts to select lands in lieu of lands lost by reason of the act of June 3, 1856, granting lands to certain railroad companies; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8335) for the relief of the heirs of A. M. Harton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8336) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oak Bowery, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8337) granting an increase of pension to Aylette F. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8338) granting a pension to Jacob Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8339) for the relief of Ella H. Candy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 8340) for the relief of Felix Scott Chambers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8341) for the relief of Richard J. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8342) for the relief of J. V. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8343) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Trustees of Walnut Grove Baptist Church, of Gibson County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 8344) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George T. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8345) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Solomon Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8346) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Parson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8347) granting an increase of pension to William Briney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8348) granting an increase of pension to Orin Haworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8349) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8350) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8351) granting a pension to Mary L. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8352) granting a pension to Henry O. Hyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8353) granting an increase of pension to William Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 8354) granting an increase of pension to Rosaline V. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8355) to reimburse George Heiner, postmaster at Morgan, Utah, for loss of postage stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8356) granting a pension to Virgil Gunnells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8357) granting a pension to Margaret L. Pistole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8358) granting an increase of pension to William Gladman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8359) granting an increase of pension to James W. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8360) granting an increase of pension to Ade Hayes Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8361) granting an increase of pension to Dock Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8362) granting an increase of pension to William D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8363) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8364) granting a pension to Julian F. Toney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 8365) granting two acres of land to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8366) granting a pension to John Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8367) granting an increase of pension to Leroy S. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8368) granting an increase of pension to John J. Kane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8369) granting an increase of pension to Peter S. E. Hansen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8370) granting a pension to Ann Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8371) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Keck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8372) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Piety; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8373) granting an increase of pension to Maria Hanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8374) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Waldron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8375) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8376) for the relief of William F. Stewart, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8377) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of the trustees of Decatur Lodge, No. 52, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Bivens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 8379) granting an increase of pension to Jasper W. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8380) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8381) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Hiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8382) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Dr. A. Ravogli and other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, to have lemons placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Homming & Rice and 6 other merchants of Malvern, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany H. R. 3298, for an increase of pension for Ira McDonald, of Sheboygan County, State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Pfister & Vogel Leather Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission; Wood Commission Co., Milwaukee Stockyards Co., Milwaukee Live Stock Exchange, and Graham Bros., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the placing of meats on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Commercial Club, Winthrop, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Desnoyers Shoe Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of John Morrow and 36 others, of Mapleton, Minn., protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of the State of North Dakota against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jamestown, N. Dak., against parcels post law; citizens of Edmore, N. Dak., favoring H. R. 2051, known as the Hanna bill, providing for paying additional compensation to the rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEALD: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 4, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Wilmington, Del., in favor of stricter laws relating to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution of General Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the repeal of the anticanteen law of February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Central Labor Union of Woonsocket, R. I., insisting upon having the battleship *New York* built in a Government navy yard in compliance with the law of 1910; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of Millmen's Local No. 5, American Brotherhood of Slate Workers, Bangor, Pa., favoring amendment of oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the classified civil-service employees of the Boston Navy Yard, favoring the enactment into law of the so-called Austin bill, and known as H. R. 32840; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the Parnell Club, of Roxbury district, Boston, Mass., against the new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of D. C. Collier, director general Panama-California Exposition, San Francisco, Cal., relative to the exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of citizens of Brainerd, Minn., against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Excelsior Chapter of the American Women's League, favoring the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bills granting increase of pension to Alpheus Hiff and Thomas L. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 2, 1911.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal God, source of all wisdom, strength, and purity, help us with increasing faith and confidence to draw copiously upon Thee for light to guide, strength to sustain, and purity to shield us from the polluting hand of sin, that we may love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with Thee our Father as faithful servants, and bring forth the fruits of the spirit abundantly, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCOME TAX.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the secretary of state of Tennessee, and directed that it be printed in the Record and Journal and that it do lie upon the Speaker's table:

STATE OF TENNESSEE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Nashville, April 28, 1911.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate joint resolution No. 14 of the Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, and by request of his excellency the governor of Tennessee, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a duly certified copy of said resolution, the same being the action of the General Assembly of Tennessee in ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to lay and collect taxes on incomes.

Very respectfully,

HALLUM W. GOODLOE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Tennessee, ss:

I, Ben W. Hooper, governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate joint resolution No. 14 of the Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed.

Done at Nashville, the capital, this 18th day of April, A. D. 1911.

By the governor:

[SEAL]

BEN W. HOOPER,
HALLUM W. GOODLOE,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 14.

Whereas the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America at its first session, begun and holden at Washington, in the District of Columbia, on Monday, the 15th day of March, 1909, by joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in words and figures as follows, to wit:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid in all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution:

"ART. XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, That said amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and is hereby, ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by his excellency the governor of Tennessee to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively.

Adopted April 7, 1911.

N. BAXTER, JR.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, April 11, 1911.

BEN W. HOOPER, Governor.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, the free-list bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the free-list bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] closing the debate on the Canadian reciprocity